

JPRS-TAC-86-061

4 AUGUST 1986

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

4 AUGUST 1986

# WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

### CONTENTS

#### SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Italy's Natta Reports on SDI to 17th PCI Congress (Milan L'UNITA, 10 Apr 86).....	1
Edinburgh Scientists Tell Defense Ministry SDI Is 'Impractical' (Peter Jones; Edinburgh THE SCOTSMAN, 20 Jun 86).....	3
Turkish Representative to Eureka Interviewed (Nejat Ince Interview; Istanbul DUNYA, 8 May 86).....	4

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

London's DAILY TELEGRAPH Reviews U.S., Soviet Positions (David Adamson; London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 3 Jul 86).....	8
XINHUA Calls U.S.-USSR Disarmament Talks Difficult (Cheng Shouheng; Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 8 Jul 86).	10

#### SALT/START ISSUES

Soviet Military Newspaper on Reagan SALT II Decision (V. Yuryev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 11 Jul 86).....	12
Briefs	
TASS Reports Stealth Crash	14
TASS: U.S. Seeks New Arms	14

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS Reports on U.S. Nuclear Arms Deployments in Europe (Moscow TASS, 11, 13 Jul 86).....	15
New Depots in FRG	15
F-16's in Belgium, by Albert Balebanov	15
'Death Base' in UK	16

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. 'Secretly Violating' CW Convention (Vladimir Bogachev; Moscow TASS, 10 Jul 86).....	17
Moscow Views CD Discussion of CW Ban (Vladimir Tsvetov; Moscow Domestic Service, 16 Jul 86).....	18

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Moscow: U.S. Fears European Arms Cuts Threaten Atlantic Unity (Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow World Service, 13 Jul 86)...	20
PRAVDA Urges 'Businesslike' Western Stance at MBFR (B. Dubrovin, D. Faddeyev; Moscow PRAVDA, 9 Jul 86).....	24
TASS Reports Sri Lankan, Bulgarian CD Delegates' Speeches (Moscow TASS, 10 Jul 86).....	26
Briefs SPD, PZPR Propose Council	27

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS Reports 17 July Planned U.S. Nuclear Test (Moscow TASS, 15, 16 Jul 86).....	28
DOE Spokesman Cited 'Provocative Behavior', by Leonid Ponomarev	28
TASS: U.S. Scientists Begin Nuclear Test Monitoring (Lev Chernenko, Vladimir Itkin; Moscow TASS International Service, 14 Jul 96).....	30
Soviet Academician: Test Ban 'First Step' in Disarmament (V.I. Goldanskiy Interview; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 11 Jul 86)....	32
PRAVDA: Greece Forbids Nuclear Modernization at U.S. Bases (Nikolay Miroshnik; Moscow PRAVDA, 12 Jul 86).....	34
Briefs SPD-SED Discussions in E. Berlin World TV Endorsement for NFZ	



## RELATED ISSUES

USSR's Kokoshin Calls for 'New Approach' to World Security (A. Kokoshin; Moscow PRAVDA, 11 Jul 86).....	36
TASS: Committee Calls for World Disarmament Conference (Sergey Baybakov; Moscow TASS, 11 Jul 86).....	39
Soviet Reports, Comments on Mitterrand Visit to Moscow (Various sources, various dates).....	41
Raimond Paris Press Conference	41
French Role in Disarmament	41
SDI, INF, European Issues, by V. Gusenkov	42
Meets Gorbachev 7 July	44
'Spirit of Sincerity'	45
Gorbachev Dinner Speech 7 July, by Mikhail Gorbachev	45
Mitterrand Dinner Speech 7 July	48
Mitterrand Meets With Gromyko	50
Mitterrand Meets Gorbachev 8 July	50
Soviet MFA Press Conference	51
Mitterrand TV Address 9 July, by Francois Mitterrand	52
'Mutual Understanding' by Victor Glazunov	53
French Spokeswoman Cited	54
Soviet Spokesman Cited	54
Mitterrand Press Conference on TV, by Francois Mitterrand	55
U.S., French Reaction Cited	58
Politburo Discussion	59
Agreement on ABM, SALT, by Gennadiy Gerasimov	59
Shevardnadze Message to UN Chief on Mediterranean (Eduard Shevardnadze; Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Jul 86).....	61
FRG SPD's Rau Discusses Arms Issues in Moscow (Moscow Domestic Service, 26 Jun 86; Moscow TASS 26 Jun 86).....	64
Vorotnikov Speech	64
Rau Meets With Dobrynin, Zagladin	65
USSR's Arbatov: U.S. Public Ignorant of Soviet Stance (Georgiy Arbatov; London MORNING STAR, 11 Jul 86).....	66
DAILY TELEGRAPH Views SDP-Liberal Alliance Commission Issues (London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 12 Jun 86).....	68
Briefs	
Beijing Religious Conference	69

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

ITALY'S NATTA REPORTS ON SDI TO 17TH PCI CONGRESS

PM090701 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 10 Apr 86 pp 5-9

[PCI Secretary General Alessandro Natta 9 April report to 17th PCI Congress in Florence]

[Excerpts] The assertion that SDI is an absolutely non-negotiable priority for the American Administration casts a worrying shadow over the negotiations under way in Geneva, which, by agreement between the two major powers, involve three matters at the same time--strategic weapons, intermediate missiles, and space weapons. How can these negotiations ever come to anything if it is asserted that there is no negotiating on one of the three points?

The resumption of nuclear testing in Nevada in response to the Soviet Moratorium was a no less alarming symptom; and its suspension announced today is a possible success for reason, and we hope that it indicates a return to the spirit of Geneva; so one which concerns the militarization of space on either side seems to us real madness [sentence as published]. Not only because the shield conceals the sword and any absolute security on one side could prompt uncontrolled fear on the other, but also on account of the further squandering of vast resources. Even in the event of a U.S.-USSR accord we will not abandon our opposition to space research for military purposes and will, if anything, pursue it with increased vigor. This is why we call for the rejection of the renewed pressure for Italy to support SDI. There is no substance to the distinction between political backing for SDI and acceptance of European enterprises' participation in the program's realization. This distinction's lack of substance is displayed by the framework agreement that the West German Government was persuaded to reach a few weeks ago. Moreover the U.S. Administration's explicit statements have sharply dispelled illusions about the volume of business and technological spinoffs deriving to European industry and the European scientific apparatus from participation in the "star wars" project.

This is not the direction for the further advance of science. We espouse the negative verdict issued in this respect by the majority of Italian, European, and U.S. scientists and we fully support the document issued by the Socialist parties of the Atlantic alliance countries which last November rightly rejected Reagan's initiative, urging Europe to concentrate on research for the peaceful use of space, as envisaged by the Eureka project. We urge the

Italian Socialist Party first and foremost to fully honor its signing of that document.

The honest acceptance of Italy's participation in the Atlantic alliance and NATO requires first and foremost observance of its defense rationale and geographical limits and of our country's rights of sovereignty. This is why we have regarded the status of our bases as crucial, especially now that we are faced with the foreseeable consequences of an intolerable tension in the Mediterranean. Acceptance of the Alliance cannot, however, entail any obligation to support SDI, which is intended to involve the NATO countries and Japan in a kind of mass mobilization with a view to an arms race that would indeed signify the irremediable subordination--not only technological--of the countries associated with the hegemony of the chief power and of its planetary designs.

/12913

CSO: 5200/2724

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

EDINBURGH SCIENTISTS TELL DEFENSE MINISTRY SDI IS 'IMPRACTICAL'

Edinburgh THE SCOTSMAN in English 20 Jun 86 p 6

[Article by Peter Jones]

[Text]

A group of senior computer and electronics scientists told Ministry of Defence officials yesterday that President Reagan's vision of a foolproof space-based defence system was impractical.

British research participation in the Strategic Defence Initiative, or "star wars" programme, would also divert computer research from "more socially and industrially relevant work" and divide the scientific community because of security requirements, the MoD men were told at a meeting in Edinburgh.

After meeting one of the scientists involved, Dr Alan Bundy, of the department of artificial intelligence, at Edinburgh University, said they had gained the impression the defence officials had agreed with much of what they had been told about the technical impossibilities.

The meeting was arranged after an appeal by Mr Tam Dalyell, MP for Linlithgow, to the former Defence Secretary, Mr Michael Heseltine.

It was organised by the

Edinburgh Computing and Social Responsibility Group, an organisation comprising scientists from Edinburgh and Heriot Watt universities and from some computer firms based in the city.

Mr Frank van Harmelen, of Edinburgh University, said: "The first group of arguments concerns the sheer size and complexity of the problems. Some of the leading computer professionals believe there is no hope of solving these problems no matter how many billions of dollars are thrown in."

The SDI system would have to be the largest network of computers ever built and it would be impossible to guarantee there would be no failures.

Mr Henry Thompson, also of the department of artificial intelligence, said in a paper given to the meeting, that the SDI would have to be fully automatic. All experience of unsupervised computer decision-making systems suggested it would be wielded in error,

but the very nature of the SDI system meant there could be no human intervention to prevent disaster.

If that happened, perhaps in the middle of an international crisis, he said, a vast array of weapons would be unleashed, some harmlessly, at non-existent missiles -- perhaps a forest fire or a meteor shower -- but some at Soviet satellites, which would invoke a response.

"Mr van Harmelen said it had been suggested that artificial intelligence could be used to tackle that problem. But the current state of the science is nowhere near the levels that would be needed.

The other group of arguments were on social grounds. He said: "In the fields of high-technology research there is a very serious shortage of skilled personnel. Whatever contracts come to British universities, they will divert and distract people from work they are doing which is in much more socially and economically relevant areas."

/9274

CSO: 5240/062

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### TURKISH REPRESENTATIVE TO EUREKA INTERVIEWED

Istanbul DUNYA in Turkish 8 May 86 p 7

[Interview with Professor Nejat Ince, Turkish representative to EUREKA and Secretary General of the Turkish Scientific and Research Organization, by correspondent Jale Karadag; date and place not specified]

[Text] Who Is Nejat Ince?

Professor Nejat Ince studied electronics and physics at the Istanbul Technical University, the University of Birmingham and the Cambridge University. He worked as a researcher and senior research manager at various research institutions in Europe and the United States for 25 years. In 1966, he was appointed professor at the Middle East Technical University. In 1981, he began serving at the Istanbul Technical University and became the Chief Counselor of the Prime Minister. He has been Secretary General of the Turkish Scientific and Research Organization [TUBITAK] since 1983.

The EUREKA project which was developed by the European countries in response to intense technological competition from the United States and Japan remains a major issue in our country as in other countries. TUBITAK Secretary General Professor Nejat Ince represents Turkey at the highest level in EUREKA whose purpose is to coordinate scientific and technological research and development activities in order to guarantee the future of European countries and to maintain their ability to generate wealth and employment.

Professor Ince said that Turkey's participation in EUREKA must be used by the public and private sector as a good opportunity to close the technological gap and to foster collective development. Stating that as a result of this project the vital importance of research and development has become more evident in our country, Ince said: "We must think not only about EUREKA, but about the future in general. Our future is as imperiled as that of the developed countries of Europe."

Professor Nejat Ince responded to our questions as follows:

DUNYA: What are your personal comments regarding the goals and accomplishments of the EUREKA project in Europe?

Ince: As you know, EUREKA, that is the European Research Coordination Organization, was created by the European community as a response to the alarming technological competition by the United States and Japan. But this is not a very recent development. The EEC realized about 5 years ago that the gap was growing with the United States and Japan in information technologies and began acting, though slowly. Europe's situation was compared to those of the United States and Japan, European strengths and weaknesses were assessed and the strategies and means necessary to close the gap were determined. As part of these strategies, in the last few years the EEC countries began the ESPRIT project on information and telecommunication technologies as well as other similar programs.

Thus the EUREKA project is a "collaboration" effort designed to coordinate advanced scientific and technological research and development activities in order to guarantee the future of the European countries and to maintain their ability to generate wealth and employment. This outcome may only be expected to benefit Europe.

DUNYA: What effects would the goals and results of the program have on our country?

Ince: Being a member of the Council of Europe, OECD and NATO and a candidate for membership in the EEC, Turkey cannot remain unaffected by the goals and results of the EUREKA project. Since our country is part of the European community, every collective enterprise by that community is of direct interest to Turkey. Thus we cannot be expected to ignore such joint research and development work in science and technology. We must always remember that the arrival of printing in Turkey exactly 276 years after it was invented in Europe was one of the major causes of the collapse and disintegration of a great and powerful empire, and we must evaluate the effects of the EUREKA project very carefully. The only course open to Turkey--which is far more concerned about the technological progress of the United States and Japan than the European countries--is to participate in this program actively in line with the interests of our country and to strengthen our existing research and development capabilities. This would a prudent move technologically and scientifically as well as politically.

In summary, I believe that the EUREKA project may produce beneficial results for our country to the extent that we participate in and contribute to the project.

DUNYA: What is the attitude of our country to this project?

Ince: EUREKA must be viewed as an opportunity to close the technological gap between Turkey and the developed countries and to foster collective development. EUREKA has made scientific and technological issues and the concept of research and development a daily topic of discussion in our country. This stance of the Western countries, which realize that their future depends on scientific and technological research and which allocate 2 to 3 percent of their gross national products to research, must be endorsed by our government and nation. Positive results of vital importance to our



country can be obtained to the extent that research and development spending--currently 0.2 percent of our gross national product--is increased and higher priority is given to research and development activities.

DUNYA: In your opinion what should be the policy and strategy pursued by our country within the framework of this posture?

Ince: While producing with older imported technologies we must improve these technologies to make them compatible with world productivity and quality standards and we must promote the adaptation and development activities needed for that. We must never neglect the need to own, to develop and to use the conventional technologies required for building and developing an infrastructure and defense industry. However, it is also vitally important to prepare for the manufacture of advanced technology products which will be the income sources of the future and to raise the training and skills of our human capital to the necessary levels.

Turkey must act without delay to make arrangements with respect to information technologies along the national goals and strategies specified by the Turkish Science Policy (including technological, implementation, production, investment, training and marketing aspects) and taking EUREKA criteria into account and must pursue a policy which will strengthen our position in the "information age. This issue was first brought up by myself at the ICCP [expansion unknown] committee of the OECD in 1982 and was reviewed by the committee as the "Turkish Project." The policies of the developed countries on this issue are generally known but the issue of what policies need to be pursued in such EUREKA participants as Turkey, Portugal, Greece, Ireland, Spain and Luxembourg still needs some study.

It is well known that new technologies, known as "high-tech," require large resources and investments, trained scientists and large homogeneous markets. Consequently, in order to achieve success, in addition to our mandatory national efforts we must develop our collaboration with our friends in the United States and Europe and we must collectively participate in the development of advanced technology products, processes and services that may be sold in world markets in future years.

DUNYA: What are your proposals regarding Turkey's priorities in the projects to be administered by EUREKA?

Ince: Since we do not have a substantive capabilities in the "advanced technology" field today, the projects that we must emphasize in EUREKA are those that need research and development. Countries with advanced information technology policies and programs (such as Britain and France) will naturally prefer to emphasize projects which have progressed beyond the research and development stage and will try to utilize countries like ours for investment and market development purposes. Countries like Turkey and Portugal may be offered to manufacture parts under license. However, we must understand that the manufacture of parts under license and with borrowed knowhow in the area of advanced information processing will not contribute significantly to the building of export-oriented complete systems.

We must also consider carefully pan-European infrastructure projects, such as telecommunications, rapid transit and environmental programs. Educational, PTT [Postal Telephone and Telegraph Administration] and TRT [Turkish Radio and Television Administration] services must be opened up to the private sector to spur industrial planning and demand for production and research and development.

Thanks to EUREKA, the vital importance of research and development has become more evident in our country. We must think not only about EUREKA, but about the future in general. We can say that our future is as imperiled as that of the other, more developed countries of Europe. Then what must we do? We must see EUREKA as an opportunity and take the necessary measures without delay.

9588

CSO: 5200/2701



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

LONDON'S DAILY TELEGRAPH REVIEWS U.S., SOVIET POSITIONS

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 3 Jul 86 p 12

[Article by David Adamson: "The Reality of Soviet Success That Tests America's Summit Aims"]

[Text]

IN WARSAW three days ago Mr Gorbachev celebrated a triumph of the status quo at the 10th Congress of the Polish Communist Party. Communism had not disintegrated under the weight of Solidarity's protest. The West's remonstrations had died away, the frontier lands of the Soviet state remained intact. Gorbachev, with General Jaruzelski at his side, was there to prove it—and to send out once again his message to Western Europe.

This time it was addressed to Europe in the role of Europe complacently allowing herself to be taken for a ride across the ocean by the American bull. Stay at home, said Mr Gorbachev. Let's all be Europeans once again, 700 million of us. Things are going to be better with me in charge, so do not abandon "the old civilisation that has formed here" because you feel that your security depends on loyally supporting the Americans. Not, of course, he added (in what has become a pro-forma rider to all such messages) that he was trying to drive wedges between the United States and its Nato allies. "When conducting talks we proceed from the political and military realities existing on the Continent," he said.

One reality is that the Soviet system's success in snuffing out nascent democracy in Poland and slaughtering Islamic guerrillas in Afghanistan has enabled Mr Gorbachev to move so confidently towards the second summit that West Europeans see as a test of American

intentions. In terms of political hegemony, he is negotiating from strength.

The summit that is taking shape for the end of the year in the United States will be more important in hard substance than its predecessor in Geneva last year. Mr Gorbachev wants to consolidate the political status quo with arms control agreements which will enable him to set relations with the West on a new and more confident footing. He needs its aid through joint ventures and technology exchanges to remedy those "distortions of socialism" which, manifesting themselves in economic paralysis and backwardness, present such a challenge to orthodox communists like himself.

What he is offering in arms control is impressive. Even President Reagan, who can hardly be regarded as a push-over on these matters, has talked about a "turning point" in the effort to ensure a safer world. Let us look at some of the offers. First, a mutual reduction of 500,000 troops by Nato and the Warsaw Pact; next a proposal to reduce strategic nuclear warheads and bombs to 8,000 each, entailing a one-third cut by the Soviet Union against a 25 per cent cut for the Americans; and, within the last two weeks, an offer of a compromise on medium-range weapons—cruise missiles and SS20s.

What the last consists of remains hazy, but it is reasonable to speculate that Mr Gorbachev is offering a revised formula balancing Soviet SS20s in the Far East and Europe

against a limited American deployment in Europe, with account taken in some form of the British and French nuclear forces. Maybe we shall hear a little more from General Chervov, a senior Soviet arms control specialist, who will be in London in the next day or two; and, of course, Mr Shevardnadze, the Soviet Foreign Minister, whose London talks with Sir Geoffrey Howe are only 10 days away.

But there is no such thing as unrequited generosity in arms control. Mr Gorbachev wants Salt I, the anti-ballistic missile treaty, adhered to until the end of the century, meaning that the Americans must do no more than carry out research on Star Wars, not develop or test it.

It may not be exactly an accident that on Tuesday Mr Casper Weinberger, the American Defence Secretary, and chief eagle among the Washington hawks, announced the successful interception in a test of a missile travelling at three times the speed of sound. Only last month Mr Reagan announced that the United States was no longer bound by Salt II, which limits strategic weapons. The Russians now want to talk about what that means, in particular its impact on a summit meant to strengthen arms control not weaken it.

It is the essence of the American position that no one, not even their closest allies (which includes Mrs Thatcher), knows exactly where they stand. Are they playing a negotiating hand very close to their chests for the maximum gain? Or will it turn out in the end that they are intent on going ahead with Star Wars, regardless of the consequences for the control of nuclear offensive weapons?

It is an issue of great moment for the Alliance. Britain and other Nato

allies, it should be remembered, believe both Salt treaties should be respected. On that they are at one with Mr Gorbachev.

The futures of Salt I and II are only the tip of the iceberg of European uncertainties about the United States. Is the Administration's distrust of the Soviet Union so great that it will in the end prefer to leave the great issues unsettled in the belief it will always have technological superiority? And is there, underlying these perplexing attitudes, a neo-isolationism which sees an America, disenchanted with its so often supine or wayward allies, secure on its own under the shield of Star Wars?

It is doubts of this sort that give such an interesting edge to Mr Gorbachev's statements and to talks such as those between Mr Shevardnadze and Sir Geoffrey. The Europeans know that we are fast leaving the post-war world. There will not be 300,000 American troops in Europe for evermore. Mr Gorbachev says that the Soviet Union has changed and if he has his way there will be virtually no foreign troops of any sort in Central and Western Europe. It is as if Europe found herself listening to both siren songs and the boom of the rocks-ahead warning.

Towards the end of last year that veteran of East-West negotiations, ex-President Richard Nixon, wrote (in Foreign Affairs magazine) that on advantage the Soviet Union had over the United States was consistency and continuity in foreign policy. "Khrushchev wore short-sleeved shirts and Brezhnev wore French cuffs, but both set the same foreign policy goals: the extension of Soviet domination and influence in the world." The Europeans should keep that in mind in the testing months between now and the next summit.

/9274

CSO: 5240/064

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### XINHUA CALLS U.S.-USSR DISARMAMENT TALKS DIFFICULT

OW111230 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1610 GMT 8 Jul 86

[Text] Beijing, 8 Jul (XINHUA) -- News Analysis: Is There a Turn in U.S.-SOVIET Disarmament Talks?

By XINHUA reporter Cheng Shouheng

At the recently concluded fifth round of U.S.-Soviet arms control talks in Geneva, the Soviet Union put forward a new "interim plan" [zhong jian fang an 0022 7035 2455 1344] for disarmament. The United States, which had always taken a negative attitude toward Soviet proposals, openly welcomed this one. President Reagan even said that he thought "this might become a turning point." Is there really a turn in U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks?

In his speech at Glassboro before the end of the fifth round of disarmament talks, U.S. President Reagan "welcomed" the new Soviet proposal. He believed that the proposal showed that "the Soviet side had begun to make serious efforts" and that "an atmosphere facilitating both sides to hold serious discussions might really exist." After the conclusion of the fifth round of talks, he, on several occasions, expressed optimism about prospects for the talks. The U.S. delegate to the talks also made a similar appraisal of the Soviet proposal.

Why has the United States, contrary to its normal behavior, become interested in a Soviet proposal?

This is mainly because of the unfavorable situation which the Reagan administration has been in since the beginning of this year. First, the explosion of the space shuttle "Challenger" has left many "star wars" research projects at a standstill, and many American scientists' and political figures' doubts about, and opposition to, the "star wars" program have further increased. As a result, there are greater difficulties in obtaining appropriations for relevant research projects. Second, the Reagan administration recently announced unilaterally that it was prepared to discard SALT II, which gave rise to a series of objections at home and abroad. Even its NATO allies raised objections to this, leaving the United States in an isolated position. Moreover, U.S. congressional midterm elections are approaching. Reagan has thus far achieved little in effecting a relaxation of U.S.-Soviet relations and reducing nuclear weapons which he promised to do during his second term. As a result, the Republican Party has found itself at a disadvantage in the elections. In this situation, the Reagan administration has had to adjust its strategy and relax its attitude toward the Soviet Union in order to show that it is not inflexible.

Meanwhile, the Soviet "interim plan" has some new meaning, which the United States can hardly turn down. First, the Soviet Union no longer completely opposes U.S. "star wars" research but only wants it to limit such research to a laboratory level or within the scope of actions already taken by the United States, and the conditions for this is that both sides will not withdraw from the treaty limiting antimissile defense systems for at least 15 years. Second, the new proposal no longer insists on simultaneous reduction of "intermediate-range nuclear weapons that can reach the other side" and strategic nuclear weapons but separates them for "individual solution." These two points are new concessions made by the Soviet Union. Thus, the new Soviet proposal has come closer to the U.S. proposition. If the United States turns down this proposal, it would meet with ever sharper criticism at home and abroad.

Of course, the Soviet Union is making these concessions in return for U.S. limitations in the "star wars" program; the program must not go beyond a "laboratory research level" for 15 years. There is not much change in the basic position. In addition, what is noticeable is that the Soviet appraisal of the results of the fifth round of talks is different from that of the United States. The Soviet Union has not been optimistic, and it has repeatedly criticized the United States for "continuing to hinder the progress of the talks and land the talks in an impasse." This is why the United States has "welcomed" the new Soviet proposal but has not yet accepted it. As a matter of fact, in his Glassboro speech, Reagan clearly said that the United States "cannot accept the proposal in its totality." According to the latest news, the U.S. Government has not yet decided on "the timing for a reply and its content." The U.S. counterproposal will not be ready for at least "another few weeks."

In a word, the Soviet Union and the United States each have their own plans despite the fact that the former put forward a new proposal and the latter showed itself to be optimistic about it. What is most fundamental is that the Soviet Union and the United States will never allow the other side to gain military superiority. Therefore, the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks will continue to be filled with hard bargaining, and it will be very difficult to have a turning point in the talks in the near future.

/9274

CSO: 5200/4054

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET MILITARY NEWSPAPER ON REAGAN SALT II DECISION

PM131821 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jul 86 Second Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Yuryev article: "Obstructionist Position"]

[Text] The world's progressive public has received with deep satisfaction the Warsaw Pact states' detailed program for reducing armaments throughout Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. This program organically and significantly supplements the program proposed by the Soviet Union on 15 January 1986 for the complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction before the end of this century. Thereby the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries refuted the fabrications widespread in the West about the Warsaw Pact's superiority in conventional forces which, it is argued, prevents a reduction of nuclear facilities in Europe and subsequently their total elimination in the world.

"You would think that was enough!" Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stated in his speech at the 10th PZPR Congress. "But unfortunately the matter of disarmament has not changed at all. That is because of the U.S. Administration's overt obstruction. Worse than that, Washington is removing the final restraints that have held the arms race in check -- SALT II and other Soviet-U.S. agreements."

Why is that?

The PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD points directly to the main reason why the administration has moved not toward the Soviet Union's view in the matter curbing the arms race but, on the contrary, toward the slippery slope of nuclear catastrophe. The reason is that "arms control is an obstacle on Washington's path to military superiority and to gaining the potential for the first strike."

Evidence of the U.S. Administration's contempt for questions of strengthening international security was provided by the Head of the White House at a recent press conference on arms control problems. As foreign press reports make clear, even seasoned journalists were shocked by the President's complete lack of knowledge about the content of the Warsaw Pact countries' proposals on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. Replying to a question about the U.S. reaction to these proposals, he began talking about... the Soviet proposals on the limitation of medium-range nuclear facilities at the Geneva talks.

At the same press conference the President stated peremptorily that the U.S. decision to refuse to observe SALT II "is irreversible." At the same time he expressed dissatisfaction at the criticism of his actions from the U.S. press and congressmen.



But that criticism is quite justified. "Abandoning SALT-II," Senator D. Bumpers (Democrat) believes, "is tantamount to getting rid of the criminal code in the hope of reducing crime." That opinion is shared by Senator J. Chafee (Republican). The White House's present move, he stated, "jeopardizes the prospects for the arms control process and the national security of the United States itself."

You cannot be more accurate than that. Moreover, that conclusion is borne out by the essence of the U.S. President's recent appeal to Congress to approve the administration's initial request for appropriations for the program of "modernizing" the U.S. Armed Forces and, in addition, for the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative." A White House spokesman characterized this attempt to force through Congress astronomical sums for militarist preparations as a "component" of the President's statement on the actual renunciation of the observance of the 1972 Interim Agreement (SALT I) and the 1979 SALT II treaty.

The U.S. Administration's leaders are not stinting in their bombastic statements on the desire for peace and disarmament. In practice, however, they invariably work in the opposite direction. In so doing they have no qualms about stating that the implementation of the U.S. Armed Forces "modernization" program has led -- believe it or not -- to arms limitation talks and "for the first time to the appearance of the possibility of profound reductions in nuclear armaments." In other words, Washington is clearly sabotaging the disarmament process.

Thus, it would seem appropriate to recall the warning contained in the CPSU Central Committee's Political Report to the 27th party congress: "...The modern world is too small and fragile for wars and the policy of strength. It cannot be saved and preserved unless we break -- resolutely and irrevocably -- with the way of thinking and acting which, for centuries, was built on the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts."

And that means realizing that winning the arms race, like nuclear war itself, is no longer possible. Neither nuclear war itself nor the preparation for it, that is, the arms race, and the striving for military superiority, can bring political profit to anybody.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1471

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

TASS REPORTS STEALTH CRASH--Paris, 12 July TASS--An Air Force plane crashed near the Vandenberg Air Force Base in California yesterday, the FRANCE PRESSE AGENCY said. The crash caused heavy forest fires. The pilot of the aircraft died in the accident. Yet representatives of the U.S. Air Force refuse to give details of the air crash referring to Pentagon's order. The aircraft, as experts say, was one of the prototypes of an "invisible" bomber. The place, where the top secret aircraft designed by the "Lockheed" firm crashed, has been cordoned off by security men of the U.S. Air Force and the police. Aircraft of all types have been banned from flying over that area. The CNN television corporation believes that the "F-19" aircraft, which crashed during a test flight, was of the "Stealth" planes, which are supposed to be "invisible" to enemy radars. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0390 GMT 12 Jul 86 LD] /12858

TASS: U.S. SEEKS NEW ARMS--Washington, 14 July TASS--Carrying out extensive work under the "star wars" program, the United States is at the same time seeking ways for acquiring new deadly types of offensive nuclear weapons. THE WASHINGTON POST reported that "the Pentagon is looking for a new type of nuclear weapon capable of attacking" the Soviet Union's intercontinental ballistic missiles. The paper recognized that "the search for a new nuclear system for mobile targets marks the beginning of what could be the next round of warhead research." The Pentagon's plans that are part of its intention to build up the U.S. strategic arsenal, vast as it already is, confirm Washington's striving to acquire nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union under the cover of a "space shield". At the same time there is vivid evidence of the reluctance of the United States, despite its declarative statements, to put an end to the nuclear arms race. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0814 GMT 14 Jul 86 LD] /12858

CSO: 5200/1471

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### TASS REPORTS ON U.S. NUCLEAR ARMS DEPLOYMENTS IN EUROPE

#### New Depots in FRG

LD111939 Moscow TASS in English 1917 GMT 11 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn July 11 TASS -- The Pentagon intends to build in the FRG new depots for nuclear weapons.

As is reported by the newspaper "FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU," depots for nuclear weapons are planned to be built at U.S. air bases at Ramstein, Memmingen, Buechel, Hahn and Noervenich in direct proximity of the location of bombers now alerted round the clock. At the Ramstein base, the depots are already in the testing stage.

The Pentagon is known to be planning the construction of bases to deploy 96 cruise missiles in the Hunsrueck mountain-mass, the Woervenich area. The construction of bunkers for these missiles is in full swing. The first batch of missiles has already been brought in. Besides, 108 "Pershing-2" missiles were deployed on the territory of the country and alerted.

Demonstrations of peace fighters are being invariably held outside the American bases in Muthlangen, Heilbronn, and Neu-Ulm, where first strike nuclear missiles are deployed. The demonstrators demand that these missiles be withdrawn from the FRG.

The Pentagon's intention to build new depots for nuclear weapons is yet another step in preparations for a nuclear war, TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov has been told in an interview by Ellen Weber, deputy chairman of the German Communist Party. The German Communist Party demands that the FRG Government place a ban on the construction of American nuclear depots, she stressed.

#### F-16's in Belgium

LD111033 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 11 Jul 86

[Text] Brussels July 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

What has been scrupulously concealed for the last 20 years ceased to be a secret: U.S. nuclear weapons are sited at the Belgian airforce base in Klein Brogel. Francois-Xavier de Donnea, Belgian minister of national defence, publicly admitted in the Chamber of Representatives on Thursday that one flight of F-16 fighter-bombers based at Klein Brogel performs a nuclear task assigned to Belgium by the NATO bloc.



BELGA news agency points out that this statement by the minister has but convinced the residents of Limburg Province that nuclear bombs were deployed near them, that they live in close quarters to the dangerous "nuclear landmine". According to the local press, these deadly weapons are under U.S. control, remain its property and are guarded exclusively by American soldiers stationed in Belgium.

According to "AGALEV" [Ecologist Party], a Flemish environmental party, the Belgian Airforce is entrusted with keeping and servicing these nuclear weapons and discharging the duties of their "carrier". Three F-16 aircraft equipped with nuclear bombs are maintained on a round-the-clock state of combat readiness at Klein Brogel. They are piloted and serviced by Belgian servicemen.

A special unit of the U.S. troops is on permanent duty at the base. It services a huge radar of the "troposcutter" type involved in the fulfillment by Belgium of its "nuclear mission".

So, it has been officially established that the small territory of Belgium is the site of not one, as was recently considered, but two bases with U.S. nuclear weapons: in Klein Brogel, in the north of the country near Holland, and in Florennes, in the south not far from the border with France, where 16 U.S. cruise missiles were deployed in March 1985.

In view of the admission made by Minister de Donnee, the Belgian press points out that the issue of the use of the nuclear weapons installed on Belgian soil is solved not in Brussels but in Washington. According to "AGALEV", this runs counter to the provisions of the Belgian Constitution and converts the country into the United States' nuclear hostage.

#### 'Death Base' in UK

LD132003 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 13 Jul 86

[Text] London, July 13 TASS -- One more "death base" will be added to the network of U.S. nuclear storage facilities in British territory. The newspaper "OBSERVER" reports that the Pentagon has disclosed information to the effect that new super-modern storages for nuclear warheads are planned to be built at the Bentwaters Air Force base near the city of Ipswich.

Such bases as Greenham Common, Holy Loch and Lakenheath already have U.S. "nuclear death" storage facilities. U.S. military experts calculated that U.S. nuclear arsenals in Britain are on the whole almost twice as big as those of Britain itself.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1472

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. 'SECRETLY VIOLATING' CW CONVENTION

LD101640 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 10 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 10 July TASS--TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

According to dispatches from Britain, work has been started on the island of Gruinart near the north-western coast of Scotland to do away with the aftermaths of experiments with bacteriological weapons conducted there by military agencies in 1942-1943. Analysts call attention to the fact that 43 years after the end of tests the contamination level on the island remains lethal and that it will take some two years to decontaminate fully the old proving ground for bacteriological weapons.

This story of the small island of Gruinart makes one think about disastrous aftermaths of large-scale development and use of bacteriological weapons for all mankind.

Experts emphasize that the destructive properties of bacteriological weapons and their effect on the environment and people are even more unpredictable than the effect of nuclear or chemical weapons. In the post-war years the USA was actively engaged in developing new types of bacteriological weapons and even studied ways of lifting viruses of Venezuelan equine encephalitis and C fever with the use of birds of passage (the so-called Pacific Project) to the territory of a potential enemy.

The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction is known to have come into force on March 26, 1975. The Soviet Union, the USA and some other states are participants in the convention. The Soviet Union is strictly abiding by all its obligations under the agreement.

Reports on the nearly 50-year contamination of "the Death Island," as residents of north-western Scotland call the former Gruinart Island, concurred in time with the publication of an article by the U.S. paper "PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER," saying that the Thomas Jefferson University in the Pennsylvania State received an order on setting up a toxin research centre. The fact that the order was placed by the Pentagon, shows the military edge of these investigations. The University of Maryland was also recently awarded a Pentagon contract on studying the effect of the typhoid virus. There were press reports indicating that the USA was conducting tests in outlying districts of Chile on effects of bacteria on people. Secret work on developing bacteriological weapons has been conducted for 30 years by a U.S. Army laboratory in Fort Detrick.

There are all grounds to believe that Washington continues secretly violating the international convention banning bacteriological weapons, raising in front of mankind a new dreadful threat, unpredictable in its aftermaths.

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW VIEWS CD DISCUSSION OF CW BAN

LD161745 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Political observer Vladimir Tsvetov commentary]

[Text] The Soviet representative has proposed at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament that the participants of the conference work out and present a draft of a convention on full and general banning of chemical weapons to the next session of the UN General Assembly [UNGA]. Here is the latest news commentary with political observer Vladimir Tsvetov at the microphone:

The scientists calculated that a nuclear weapon being delivered by one strategic bomber is capable of striking the area of 30 square kilometers. If the very same bomber takes on board a chemical weapon it strikes an area of up to 60 square kilometers. This is twice as much. It is clear from this data alone how great the necessity is to completely eliminate chemical weapons. Such a necessity stands out with even more clarity if we take into consideration that the United States intends to start broad production of binary gas, which is an especially dangerous means for mass elimination of people. Calling for a convention on full and general elimination of chemical weapons before the 41st UNGA session, the Soviet Union also tables a proposal on the content of the convention.

This includes: destruction of chemical weapons stockpiles, destruction or dismantling of the installation where such weapons are produced, and last, an effective control over the observance of the convention, including systematic international on-spot inspections.

The Soviet proposals are met with a positive response in many countries, including many NATO countries. At the same session of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament where the Soviet representative spoke, the delegate from Great Britain announced his government's efforts to ban chemical weapons. True, this announcement does not quite conform to the British secretary for defense's position when, at the May meeting with his NATO colleagues in Brussels, he approved the American plan for production of binary chemical missiles and bombs. Nonetheless, it is possible to consider the announcement as evidence of Great Britain's anxiety in connection with the dissemination of chemical weapons in Western Europe and in the world.

As far as other American allies are concerned, 6 out of 15 NATO participants spoke out in Brussels against production and siting binary gas ammunition [razmeshcheniye] in Western Europe. They are: The Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Greece, Luxembourg and Iceland. Their apprehensions in connection with the American chemical plans for

Western Europe are natural. In case of chemical war, the losses among civilian population would exceed the losses of the forces 20-30 times. In other words, chemical weapons would turn Western Europe into a double hostage of the United States: nuclear and chemical.

In striving for full and general elimination of chemical weapons, the Soviet Union has done everything for the quickest conclusion to draw up the convention. Now it is the turn of the United States. It is now mainly dependent on the United States, whether or not the UN General Assembly receives the draft of the convention, which is so important and essential for mankind.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1476

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### MOSCOW: U.S. FEARS EUROPEAN ARMS CUTS THREATEN ATLANTIC UNITY

LD132236 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 13 Jul 86

["Top Priority" panel discussion presented by Vladimir Posner with Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov from the United States of America and Canada Institute in Moscow]

[Excerpts][Posner] I think that, the time being what it is, we should look at the relationship between the Soviet Union, Europe, and of course the United States. The reason I say this is the occasion of President Mitterrand's visit to the Soviet Union and the conversation, the dialogue, that is going on between -- that has been going on between the leadership of the two countries, the Soviet Union and France. Obviously, one of the things that at least some quarters in America are saying is that here is yet another attempt on the part of the Soviet Union to drive a wedge between Europe and the United States, and that the general secretary's speech when he addressed the president of France made a point of indicating the importance of Europe, the importance of Soviet-European relations, and the fact that Europe, should play a far greater role in all areas -- peace, economic, disarmament -- then it has played up until the present day. So, first of all, how would you respond to this allegation that the Soviet Union is trying to drive a wedge between Europe and the United States and thereby weaken the NATO alliance and the alliance in the West in general?

[Bogdanov] Before I will try to respond to these allegations, let me say something about the visit itself.

[Posner] Yes, please do Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] You know, I believe that president's visit is important by itself first of all, but, if you keep in mind that he came to Moscow from Washington when he saw President Reagan, had rather lengthy talks with him about many international problems, and we believe that he has brought to Moscow some ideas from over there, then this visit looks quite an important one; that's number one. Number two: That famous, you know, American accusation, or allegation that the Soviet Union is just dying to separate Western Europe from America, let me explain to my listeners over there that when Americans say that we are dying to separate Western Europe from America I have an impression that they are talking about some thing, you know, some thing, some object, some, you know, bowl or whatever it is that you can separate from some thing. Just you take a knife or whatever it is, you just cut it and you separate it. It's a very primitive and you cannot separate such a huge, you know (?entity) as Western Europe -- cultural, political, economical (?entity) from some thing. It's a thing by itself. It's a huge (?entity) by itself which you cannot separate without its will from anything. And there is another point. We have no desire to separate Western Europe from America.

[Fenner] Why?

[Bogdanov] Just I tell you why, just because we are very realistic people and very pragmatic people. We take into consideration a number of factors, historical, political, and economical. Of course Western Europe by its culture, by its past, more close to America than to the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe. That is a fact and we admit. Economically of course they are more close to America, to the Western world than to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and politically they are members of one political-military alliance -- NATO. So if you are realistic you know you cannot, whatever you may dream of, and we are not dreamers.

[Fenner] Er, Professor Bogdanov...

[Bogdanov] Yes.

[Fenner] Allow me to play devil's advocate! General secretary Gorbachev in his speech spoke about achieving a significant level of disarmament in Europe from the Atlantic coast to the Ural Mountains. Now, could or could not the United States see this as a threat to its security? Would you care to touch on that, Professor Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Well, security is a term which is interpreted differently by different people, just as is the Atlantic unity concept. You see, there are people who think that cohesive -- cohesion -- in the NATO alliance can only be obtained in a condition of confrontation, that is only when there is a perception of a strong Soviet threat to the West and that threat is used as a disciplining influence, as a factor which brings Western unity and that is there are a lot of bonds which tie together Western Europeans and the Americans -- cultural, economic, political and so on -- and I don't think that our peace proposals threaten any of those. In fact, I think that if this perception of the Soviet threat is replaced by a perception of a common interest between the East and Western Europe, I think that should make the American-Western European relations healthier, more normal. Therefore, I don't see how one should see the Soviet proposals concerning disarmament in Europe as in any way threatening to the security of the United States.

[Fenner] But tell me, Professor Plekhanov, if you were a member of the military-industrial complex in the United States would you see a proposal like that as a threat to your interests?

[Plekhanov] I guess I would be up in arms against any peace proposals, any disarmament proposals.

[Bogdanov] Well, you know it seems to me that that question, whether it is solved by the American participation in Helsinki process, don't you think so? America is an active member of the Helsinki spirit, if you like. So your question -- whether it is in their security interests or not has been already answered by the fact of their participation and active participation in Helsinki process. So now that's going on, what's going all about [as heard] just to improve, enhance Helsinki spirit, if you like, enhance Helsinki process which is in the interest of all the parties, (meaning) USSR, United States, Canada, and all the rest.



[Posner] Getting back to the military issue, the general secretary, alluding to the situation in Europe and to what appears to be in different areas a certain imbalance, that is to say that in some kinds of armaments the Eastern bloc has an advantage, in some the Western bloc. He proposed what I believe is an interesting step and that is that -- let the two sides cut down where they have the advantages.

[Bogdanov] Ya, ya, that's a very interesting and very far-reaching proposal and if the West and if the American side take this proposal in its proper value I believe that a very important and very efficient, if you like, road is open for many, many solutions and my, you know, understanding of the secretary's statement is that no weapons system is excluded from the bargaining, you know.

[Plekhanov] Everything is negotiable.

[Bogdanov] Ya, you are right, Sergey. Everything is negotiable. That's very important point, and I wish that that point was rightly taken over there.

[Posner] Opening his discussion, his speech addressed to President Mitterrand, General Secretary Gorbachev underlined the fact that there are some momentous changes occurring inside the Soviet Union; that we've embarked on a new program of development; that there is a tremendous excitement and movement going on as we develop our economy, overcoming some of our past problems. But for us to achieve the ends that we have mapped out we absolutely need peace. In other words, for us any kind of military expenditure is a drain on our economy. I think this is understood by some of our more adamant foes in the West and do you see an attempt on their part to make that precisely impossible, that is to say, to block our ability to move ahead by pulling us into this arms race?

[Bogdanov] Vladimir, you make very important point. I believe that the Americans have a very influential and very strong body of politicians just aiming at blocking our efforts to improve our economy. And they believe that by arms race on the American conditions they will ruin us. Just this day I saw a very interesting article in NEW YORK TIMES by Drew Middleton, you know.

[Posner] Yes.

[Bogdanov] He is trying to convince his readers that no, we can ruin them because now they have no war, Moscow, Leningrad, and the other Soviet sacred cities are not under German, you know, siege, so they will not sacrifice. I mean the Soviet people will not sacrifice now as they used to sacrifice in the Great Patriotic War. I would like to point to Dr Drew Middleton -- by the way, I respect him very much as a military analyst but in this particular case I am literally speaking amazed how...

[Posner] Cynical.

[Bogdanov] ...cynical and primitive his assessment of the Soviet mood, you know. He just crossed off the Soviet history and the Russian history, you know, and he does not take into consideration that it's more than a moment, you know, or minute of sacrifice. It's our history, the whole of our history, when Soviet -- Russian -- Soviet security belonged to the really sacred place of our lives; genetic, like genetic code you know. [sentence as heard]

[Posner] Yes, well, with time running out, here's what I'd like to ask you in connection with that. It's my feeling that Western Europe does not share this view, does not share the view that there is a sense or even a logic in forcing the Soviet Union into an open-ended arms race and thereby hinder its economic development. And since that view is not shared in Europe, could it not be said that by such policies, it is not the Soviet Union that is separating Europe from the United States but perhaps the United States itself is separating itself from Europe because of that kind of policy. How do you feel about that?

[Plekhanov] I think you're right. The United States is forcing on Western Europe a security formula which is out of date and out of synch with reality. Europe needs a different approach to security. The United States is emerging in -- vis-a-vis Western Europe -- as a divisive force, as a force which is trying to undermine the status quo, to undermine the normal development of our continent for the sake of what? For the sake -- some think and I agree with that -- the United States is doing that because it is the only power which is pretending to the role of a global policeman which wants to rearrange international affairs according to its liking. No other country in the world tries to do that, only the United States. It's a very short-sighted policy. It certainly will not lead to any success but it can and it will undermine international security and bring about a lot of unneeded spending in the military area and increase the danger of nuclear war. So the sooner that policy is changed the better. I think that Western Europe and the Soviet Union and any other country in the world would do itself a great service if it tried to dissuade the United States in one way or another from pursuing this line.

[Posner] Which ultimately, I think, would be to the advantage of the United States.

[Plekhanov] Of course.

[Bogdanov] Yes.

[Posner] On that note I want to thank both of you and end this edition of "Top Priority." We invite you to write us. We'd like to have your comments, your suggestions. We'd be delighted to discuss them at a further date. Tune in next week at the same time for the next edition of "Top Priority."

/12858

CSO: 5200/1474



## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### PRAVDA URGES 'BUSINESSLIKE' WESTERN STANCE AT MBFR

PM101054 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent B. Dubrovin and TASS correspondent D. Faddeyev dispatch: "Business-like Approach Needed"]

[Text] Vienna, July -- The latest round of the Vienna talks on armed forces and arms reductions in central Europe is over. The discussions in the Hofburg Palace were held in the complex and tense atmosphere that has arisen as a result of the confrontational policy of the United States and certain other Western powers.

The socialist countries participating in the talks have made every effort to maintain and strengthen peace, to end the arms race, and to radically improve the international situation. It is this goal that is pursued by the Warsaw Pact states' appeal to the NATO states and all European countries containing a program for armed forces and conventional arms reductions in Europe.

It is generally recognized that the proposals that came out of Budapest are an important supplement to the 15 January Soviet program for removing the nuclear threat and eliminating mass destruction weaponry. At the same time they are independent of them [oni nosyat samostoyatelnyy kharakter]. Their implementation would undoubtedly promote a reduction in the threat of war and would promote the cause of real detente on our continent. Reaffirming their interest in armed forces and arms reductions throughout Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- the Warsaw Pact states stressed that the achievement of mutually acceptable accords at the Vienna talks would also serve the goals of strengthening all-European security.

Unfortunately, the state of affairs at the Vienna talks remains depressing. No agreement has yet been reached even on the material content of a proposed agreement. Having formally adopted the socialist countries' outline proposals on initial reductions in Soviet and U.S. troops in central Europe and the subsequent pegging [neuvlicheniye] of the level of the sides' armed forces and arms in the region, the Western participants in the talks distorted the proposals and filled them with content which again calls into question the possibility of reaching agreement. In the Western scenario the resolution of the urgent task of ending and limiting the arms race, lowering the level of military confrontation, stabilizing the military-political situation, and, consequently, building confidence, is to all intents and purposes replaced by manipulations about verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka], which pursue another aim -- namely, revealing the other side's defense structure. The adoption of this position is not dictated by the requirements of the proposed agreement and could lead to serious interference in states' internal affairs.

The West's proposals are also aimed at violating the reciprocity principle. It is proposed, for instance, to extend inspection [proverka] measures beyond the reduction region to take in a whole number of the Soviet Union's western military districts. And this absurd demand is being made on the pretext that this territory adjoins the reduction region! If that logic is followed, why not extend these measures to the territories of all NATO countries adjoining the Western reduction region? And if the situation is examined from the strategic standpoint, the question of U.S. territory arises too.

The socialist countries pointed out the arbitrary nature and unacceptability of the Western "package" of verification [kontrolnyy] measures some 6 years ago.

[Paragraph continues] However, since then the Western side has not only failed to make any constructive changes to its position on verification [kontrol] but has hardened its position even further. This approach by the NATO countries betokens only one thing -- a desire to keep the talks deadlocked.

We still believe, the head of the Soviet delegation stated on behalf of the Warsaw Pact states at the closing plenary session, that the implementation of the socialist countries' 20 February draft agreement would be the best result which could be achieved in the situation now prevailing at the Vienna talks. Its main purport is to finally switch from words to deeds and to make a perhaps modest but practical start toward ending and limiting the arms race. The component elements in the 20 February draft agreement have been thoroughly balanced and take both sides' security interests strictly into account.

The totality of the verification [kontrol] measures proposed by the socialist countries accords with the material content of the planned agreement. They give both sides confidence that commitments under agreement will be fulfilled and rule out the possibility of abuses of those commitments for purposes contrary to the principle of equal security and the improvement of international relations.

The socialist countries' plan is constructive and takes both sides' interests wholly into account. It is -- and this is now openly recognized by objective Western observers -- a good basis for getting the Vienna dialogue moving. The talks must finally produce mutually acceptable positive results. To that end a businesslike approach is needed from the Western participants in the talks, as is a desire on their part to seriously listen in practice rather than in words to the voice of reason coming from Budapest.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1474

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### TASS REPORTS SRI LANKAN, BULGARIAN CD DELEGATES' SPEECHES

LD102248 Moscow TASS in English 2219 GMT 10 Jul 86

[Text] Geneva July 10 TASS -- A complex of large-scale Soviet initiatives put forward in the statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev of January 15 opens up the way to agreements on dramatic reductions of nuclear weapons arsenals. This has been stated by Abdul Carder Shahul Hameed, minister of foreign affairs of Sri Lanka, who addressed the conference on disarmament held here.

He pointed out that the ensuring of a peaceful use of outer space and the prevention of the transfer of the arms race to space were of much importance. The preservation of the Soviet-American anti-Ballistic-Missile Treaty of 1972 and the working out of a multilateral agreement on the banning of anti-satellite weapons would be the first step towards the prevention of an arms race in space.

According to Konstantin Tellalov, representative of Bulgaria, the unwillingness of the U.S. and its closest allies to hold concrete talks on such vital problems as the prevention of a nuclear war, the curbing of the arms race and the banning of nuclear weapons tests is the continuation of their policy aimed at the realization of gigantic arms buildup programs, primarily with regard to nuclear arms, and at achieving military-strategic superiority.

A speech of the U.S. representative at the conference struck a discordant note. He tried to present Washington as nearly an advocate of curbing the arms race.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1474

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BRIEFS

SPD, PZPR PROPOSE COUNCIL--Bonn, 8 Jul--At a session of the joint working group of the FRG Bundestag Social Democratic Party faction and the Sejm's PZPR deputies' club which is drawing up measures to strengthen confidence in Europe it has been proposed that a "European Council for Confidence-Building Measures" be established. [Tass report: "Poland-FRG"] [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4 PM] /12858

CSO: 5200/1474

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### TASS REPORTS 17 JULY PLANNED U.S. NUCLEAR TEST

#### DOE Spokesman Cited

LD152220 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 16 TASS -- The Reagan administration which continues to ignore the demands of the American and world public to stop nuclear explosions and join the Soviet moratorium on them has decided to conduct next Thursday another nuclear weapon test in Nevada.

The explosion with a capacity of some 150 kilotons is to be staged at 8:00 in the morning, local time, a spokesman of the U.S. Department of Energy reported. It will be the 14th announced U.S. test since the coming into effect of the Soviet moratorium.

#### 'Provocative Behavior'

LD161542 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev;

An underground nuclear explosion at the Nevada test site in the United States is slated for tomorrow. Despite the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear blasts, in effect since August 6 last year, the Washington administration demonstratively ignores the example of goodwill on the part of the USSR.

Why this provocative behaviour in Washington, the more so, for the majority of Americans are, at present, in favour of joining the Soviet moratorium?

The U.S. leaders are building up the country's military might in order to exert political and military pressure throughout the world. They remain prisoners of the illusions that the world is the U.S. domain.

The world is no longer what Washington thinks it is. As to the Soviet Union, it proceeds in its policy from real changes. What are they?

In its scientific and technological development, mankind has already designed weapons that would bring, once used, unpredictable consequences. Security on our planet should be one for all. In order to start the process of ensuring this kind of security, it is necessary to give up the further arms race, start real disarmament and diminish the risk of nuclear war.

According to the Soviet side, ending nuclear tests should become a first step in that direction. It will soon be one year since the Soviet Union suspended its testing in the hope that the United States would follow suit.

In addition to that, the Soviet Union advanced a programme of abolishing nuclear weapons by the turn of the century. Washington and its NATO allies received concrete proposals from the Warsaw Treaty member-countries concerning the destruction of chemical weapons and deep cuts in conventional armaments.

Compromise proposals related to medium-range missiles and cuts in strategic nuclear weapons were tabled at the Geneva talks.

Officials in Washington and some other capitals of the NATO Countries still think in terms of pre-nuclear times, in categories of forces and military superiority.

In the present-day conditions, no nation, however powerful, or a group of nations can build their own security and prosperity on dictating with the help of military might their will to other countries and peoples.

This policy is destructive. Nowadays, there exists only one battlefield -- the negotiating table, with talks conducted on the principle of equality and equal security. It is only in this field, that it is possible to find a constructive solution to all problems that worry the world.

/12858  
CSO: 5200/1477

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### TASS: U.S. SCIENTISTS BEGIN NUCLEAR TEST MONITORING

LD141532 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1355 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Text] Karaganda, 14 Jul (TASS) -- Correspondents Lev Chernenko and Vladimir Itkin report from East Kazakhstan:

Perhaps talk by 100 percent of Americans was heard for the first time in this place. In line with an accord reached between the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council and the USSR Academy of Sciences, U.S. scientists have begun installing equipment here to verify the moratorium on nuclear blasts. In the United States of America a plan is being developed to receive a group of Soviet specialists who will carry out observations near the nuclear test site in Nevada.

Having spent 4 days in Kazakhstan, Tom Cochran, deputy chairman of the Natural Resources Defense council, left here for Moscow for the international conference with scientists for an end to nuclear tests, taking with him the first seismogram obtained on American instruments. Some 3 dozen autographs in Russian and English have been left on it by scientists, specialists, and journalists. Giving his appraisal of the first seismogram, Tom Cochran said: "In this place it is calm".

The Americans have transported over 2 metric tons of cargo to Kazakhstan. It was initially delivered to Karaganda (3,200 km from Moscow), and then 5 AV-2 biplanes took the load to Karakoralinsk.

Great significance for the success of the work is attached to the place where the equipment is installed. It is important for obtaining integrity in the results. In accordance with the sides' accord, the equipment in Kazakhstan and Nevada will be American. Using identical instruments will avoid divergences in parameters.

American scientists plan to deliver more complex equipment here. With the help of the Soviet side bore-holes up to a depth of 100 meters will be drilled. Installation of the instruments at the bottom of these bore-holes will totally exclude outside interference.

During the course of the year, two American specialists will be stationed near Karakoralinsk. Together with their Soviet colleagues, they will observe earth vibrations here and at another two points 150-200 meters away from the town.

Every 3 hours they take instrument readings. Even at night taking over from one another the scientists go up about 30 meters from the base to the seismographs. They had little time for an interview. Nevertheless it was possible to have one with James Bruin,

professor at the University of California in San Diego; and one of leaders of the American project, Charles Archambo, a professor from the University of Colorado.

James Bruin highly assessed Soviet seismological science. He said that by participating in this experiment he would like to make his contribution to resolving the problem of disarmament halting nuclear tests.

According to Archambo, Soviet scientists will carry out work in Nevada as soon as August. The delay is only over selecting the site.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1477



## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### SOVIET ACADEMICIAN: TEST BAN 'FIRST STEP' IN DISARMAMENT

PM160905 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Academician V.I. Goldanskiy by A. Ivanko: "The Scientists' Sacred Duty"]

[Text] The struggle for nuclear disarmament and a nuclear test ban is gathering momentum. These questions top the agendas of many international conferences held by public organizations, scientists, and cultural figures. Lenin Prize Winner Academician V.I. Goldanskiy, member of the Soviet Pugwash Committee, attended the international Pugwash meeting which ended in Geneva recently. Our conversation began with the question as to what role scientists and cultural figures can play in the struggle for nuclear disarmament.

[Goldanskiy] Over the past few days I have been acquainting myself attentively with the delegates' speeches at the recent USSR Writers Union congress where many speakers dwelt on the role of science in the modern world. As a rule, criticism was being voiced. This has left me with mixed feelings. On one hand, not all the reproaches leveled at scientists were just, on the other hand, it is pleasing to see genuine concern for the fate of mankind, for the fate of the country. You begin to better understand what a great weight science carries in modern society and how great the belief is that science can cause untold harm, or vice versa, deliver mankind from it.

Today mankind is living under the threat of nuclear war that hangs over it like the sword of Damocles. Scientists' most sacred duty is to avert this danger. The main means for achieving this is nuclear disarmament. The danger of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war is also becoming more real with every passing year. The Pugwash movement participants have noted more than once that this scenario for war breaking out is quite probable. Events such as the Challenger catastrophe and the accident at the Chernobyl AES which bear out that there is no fail-safe guarantee for technical safety in conditions of advanced computerization have played a great role in making people realize this danger. It would be useful to organize international scientific research on the lines of the research carried out into the "nuclear winter," research that would include quantitative assessments of the probability of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war and of the rate at which this probability increases in proportion with the buildup of arms and their increasing sophistication.

[Ivanko] "Nuclear winter," "accidental nuclear war" -- after all, the future of mankind is behind these terms. Will mankind survive in the event of a catastrophe?

[Goldanskiy] I looked into this problem, in particular when I studied the origins of life from the viewpoint of physics, comparing the capacity of biological systems for self-reproduction with the optical properties characteristic of the basic "molecules of life" -- nucleic acids and proteins. An analysis of all the known data about the origins of life indicates that in the prebiological, inanimate world, the preconditions for life arose not through gradual evolution but through a kind of jump, a phase transition, rather like water changing into ice at a certain temperature. Thus, formal analysis leads to the conclusion that mankind can by its own doing introduce such powerful additional factors into the conditions prevailing on the earth today that it will not just annihilate civilization but will also completely destroy the biosphere in general and return the earth to the conditions that prevailed when there was no life. That is a phase transition in reverse only this time effected by man himself.

It cannot be denied that scientists have had a direct part in bringing about this state of affairs; the genie has been let out of the bottle, and therefore they are obliged to do their utmost in order to get it back in.

[Ivanko] Everyone understands that a nuclear catastrophe must be prevented. How can this be done, by what method? Where in your view, should we begin?

[Goldanskiy] Without any doubt, a complete and general ban on nuclear tests would be the most effective first step. As is known, in 1963 a treaty was concluded banning nuclear weapons tests in three media -- the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. Had all nuclear tests been banned then, the present-day world would be a world without cruise missiles, multiple nuclear warheads, and neutron weapons. The tests that are currently being carried out will provide the basis for the creation of new generations of nuclear weapons, including "star wars" weapons -- nuclear-excited X-ray lasers, for instance. Without nuclear tests it will not be possible to improve existing nuclear weapons or to create new ones.

You often hear: At one time the problem of verification [kontrol] was cited as the main obstacle in the path of the conclusion of a general nuclear test ban treaty.

Now the technical means are much more sophisticated than they were in 1963. According to the view of most scientists they make it possible to register even very low-yield tests and to reliably distinguish them from earthquakes. The Obninsk seismic observatory, for instance, registered the U.S. explosion codenamed "Mighty Oak" on 10 April whose yield was a mere 1.3 kilotons.

Most people throughout the world, but above all scientists in all countries, including the United States, favor a ban on nuclear tests. It is no accident that U.S. scientist and Nobel Prize winner Glenn Seaborg -- the man who discovered plutonium and who for some 10 years chaired the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission -- is one of the initiators of the nuclear test ban movement. Scientists the world over agree -- the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has met with their full support.

In conclusion I would like to appeal to all scientists, cultural workers, and writers. We can and must play a major role in the struggle for nuclear disarmament. I recall U.S. director Stanley Kramer's movie "On the Beach" which depicted mankind's destruction through nuclear war. It ends with the following shot -- in an empty, lifeless street a banner is fluttering with the inscription: "There is still time, brother." Let us not waste time while we still have it.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1477

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA: GREECE FORBIDS NUCLEAR MODERNIZATION AT U.S. BASES

PM151031 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 86 Second Edition p 5

[Nikolay Miroshnik "Commentator's Column": "Against Nuclear Arsenals"]

[Text] The Greek Government has refused the U.S. request to permit the modernization of stockpiles of American nuclear weapons located on its territory. An official spokesman for Athens announced that this decision has been taken in connection with the government's intention to clear nuclear arsenals from the country's territory.

Let us note that this intention is already being put into practice: In October of last year the American Honest John missiles were removed from northern Greece. Thus the present Greek leadership, actively supporting the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans, is aware that the existence on the country's territory of weapons of mass destruction, which in effect it does not control, makes the country a U.S. nuclear hostage, a fact the people will not tolerate.

There are many such hostages on the Pentagon's lists, especially in Western Europe, where the territories of certain of the NATO allies are literally crammed with various kinds of American nuclear weapons. THE WASHINGTON POST, citing U.S. Congress documents, has just reported, for instance, the existence of 20 military bases where American fighter-bombers carrying nuclear weapons are stationed in a state of around-the-clock combat readiness. Fourteen of these bases are in Western Europe. Thus all it takes is a command from across the ocean -- and who can give an absolute guarantee that such a command will not be sent as a result of an erroneous assessment, or maliciously? -- and in a few minutes, nuclear death could be launched from the territory of, say, the FRG or Italy, whether they like it or not. However much the United States may try to reassure its allies by talking about the "dual key" and joint control over the atom bombs and missiles deployed in Western Europe, in effect it is only the Pentagon's finger on the launch button.

The way out of this alarming situation is to rid the Old World of the nuclear arsenals imposed on it, to create nuclear-free zones here, and ultimately to turn all of Europe into a zone without weapons of mass destruction. As is known, the Soviet Union, putting forward a whole package of constructive initiatives aimed at achieving these goals, has taken on a commitment never to use nuclear weapons against states that do not have such weapons on their territory.

To rid Europe of nuclear arsenals is a realistic task today. Only one thing is needed: for the leaders of the continent's countries to heed the demands of their own peoples, who are coming out increasingly resolutely against the threat of war.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1477

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### BRIEFS

SPD-SED DISCUSSIONS IN E. BERLIN--Berlin, 30 June (TASS)--A regular meeting of the joint working group of the political leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the group of the Social Democratic Party of Germany in the FRG Bundestag on the question of creating in central Europe a zone free from battlefield nuclear weapons, was held here today, the ADN news agency reported. Having discussed the new proposals on disarmament in the sphere of conventional armaments, contained in the Budapest address of the Warsaw Treaty member states to NATO member countries, to all European countries, the working group emphasized the need for exerting every effort to hold within a short period of time appropriate concrete talks. The working group expects that the FRG Government gives a positive answer to the proposals advanced by the governments of the GDR and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the principles and main directions of the effort to create in central Europe a zone free from chemical weapons. This would speed up the achievement of unity with regard to global ban on chemical weapons, says the report. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 30 Jun 86 LD] /12858

WORLD TV ENDORSEMENT FOR NFZ--Prague, 10 July (TASS)--The World Federation of Trade Unions welcomes the DPRK's proposal that the Korean Peninsula should become a nuclear-free zone, the World Federation of Trade Unions stresses in its statement which has been distributed here. The United States should accept the DPRK's proposal and stop bringing nuclear armaments into South Korea, reduce and later liquidate all weapons deployed on the Peninsula. The world public opinion approved and supported the DPRK's readiness to immediately take part in negotiations on that issue with the U.S. Administration and the South Korean authorities. The World Federation of Trade Unions calls upon the working people and trade unions of all countries to express solidarity with the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea their efforts to make the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free zone. Such a step would be a major contribution to consolidation of peace and security in Asia and the whole world, the statement stresses. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1118 GMT 10 Jul 86 LD] /12858

CSO: 5200/1477

## RELATED ISSUES

### USSR'S KOKOSHIN CALLS FOR 'NEW APPROACH' TO WORLD SECURITY

PM151003 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Kokoshin article: "From Realistic Standpoints: Military-Political Aspects of International Security"]

[Text] One of the most important elements of our party's foreign policy strategy elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress is the concept of creating an all-embracing system of international security.

This concept is the result of a scientifically substantiated, realistic analysis of the present-day system of international relations and the basic trends in its development, in all their multifaceted and contradictory nature. The fact that this concept was put forward is evidence of the new level of our state's economic, political, and defense might and its confidence in its own forces and potential. Through many years of efforts by the Soviet people and our party, a defense potential has been created that, represents a substantial "margin of safety."

The realities of our age are such that the "integration" of the entire structure of international relations and the sharp increase in the interdependence of states have made the world too crowded and vulnerable for wars and strong-arm policies. The physical characteristics of modern weapons and the packed arsenals of the opposing sides are such that no state has a hope of defending itself exclusively by military means, however mighty the defense it creates.

Thus the problem of ensuring international security increasingly becomes a political problem, and the means of resolving it must likewise be political. Therefore security, as the Political Report noted, "if we are talking about USSR-U.S. relations, can only be mutual, and if you take international relations in general, it can only be universal."

The correctness of this conclusion is indicated by the active politicization of many issues that recently were apparently of a purely military or military-political nature. These questions have become the subject of wide debates in circles of the anti-nuclear, antimilitarist movement. [paragraph continues]

They are the subject of bilateral and multilateral talks and dialogues between state and political leaders of different countries.

In present-day conditions an important factor for international security is the military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO. Here the central role belongs to the strategic nuclear arms balance. Parity with the United States in strategic nuclear delivery vehicles was achieved by the Soviet Union by the early seventies, despite all the U.S.



efforts to preserve nuclear superiority. In recent years the Soviet Union has repeatedly demonstrated the ability to maintain the equilibrium achieved, not allowing the United States to secure any significant advantage militarily or politically, whatever means and methods the opposite side may use. Even the tremendous efforts made by U.S. militarist forces in the eighties have been unable to achieve anything. They have only increased international tension and reinforced the trend toward a reduction in strategic stability.

Special concern is caused by the fact that the present level of the balance of nuclear potentials is excessively high. The equal level of danger it ensures for each side cannot forever remain the basis of peace on earth. The preservation of this situation is having an increasingly grave effect on the sociopsychological condition and morality of world civilization. The continuation of the arms race will inevitably increase the weight on the human psyche and lead to an increase in the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. This means that even if the military-strategic equilibrium is preserved, as a result of new, ever more complex rounds in the arms race, its stability will inevitably fall -- to such an extent that even parity will cease to be a factor for military-political deterrence.

The stockpiling and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons is capable of increasing the hypothetical capacity for a disabling strike against the enemy. The addition of ABM and space arms to the existing offensive systems would greatly increase the reactionary imperialist forces' hopes of engaging in aggression with impunity, and would thus further increase the threat of nuclear war. The stability of the military-strategic equilibrium is also reduced by the onset of a new stage in the development of conventional armed forces and armaments, since systems are emerging whose operation is comparable with that of weapons of mass destruction. Moreover the greatly increased range of conventional weapons will make it possible at once to engage in active combat operations not only the border regions, but the territories of the countries concerned, which was not the case in past wars.

All these dangerous trends require the adoption of urgent, radical measures. The Soviet Union proposes that the level of military confrontation be lowered considerably. Equal security should be guaranteed not by an extremely high level, but by an extremely low level of military-strategic equilibrium, taking into account not only quantitative, but also qualitative factors, including geostrategic factors, in the military balance. An important component of the concept of an all-embracing system of international security is the USSR's proposals on ridding the world of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. In general, this concept covers a wide range of military, political, and also economic and humanitarian aspects of the problem, including sociopsychological factors.

If we regard the military-political sphere as the core of the security problem, here the USSR proposes, alongside the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the banning and destruction of chemical weapons and the renunciation of the creation of other means of mass destruction and the militarization of space. There should be a strictly verified decrease of the levels of military potentials down to the limits of reasonable sufficiency, as well as a proportionate and commensurate reduction in military budgets. Great significance would be attached to the renunciation by the nuclear powers of war against each other or against third states -- either nuclear or conventional war.

The military-political aspect of the all-embracing system of international security also presupposes the elaboration of a package of measures aimed at strengthening confidence between states and creating effective guarantees against an attack on them from outside.



A substantial contribution to increasing military-political stability would be to ensure, on a permanent basis, the just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts, and also to elaborate effective measures to cut short international terrorism.

Since the 27th CPSU Congress the Soviet concept of an all-embracing system of international security has been further developed in a number of concrete initiatives. The USSR's proposal to reach an agreement on a significant reduction in all components of ground forces and tactical aircraft of the European states, as well as the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces stationed in Europe, over all the European territory from the Atlantic to the Urals, was received with great interest, especially in Europe. Simultaneously, along with conventional arms, there would also be a reduction in operational-tactical nuclear arms. In combination with the proposal for the USSR and the United States to take on a commitment not to create or to produce new types of conventional arms with comparable destruction potential to weapons of mass destruction, as well as with a number of other initiatives of the Warsaw Pact countries, this opens up new prospects for a radical change for the improvement in the situation in the sphere of conventional armed forces and armaments. Another act in the direction of implementing the concept of security was the decision to extend the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions to 6 August 1986. The Soviet Union once again calls insistently on the American leaders to agree to a ban on nuclear tests.

The position of the present state leadership of the United States and a number of other leading capitalist states is characterized by a reluctance to face up to the realities of the modern world and accept the new philosophy of international security. Many Western mass information organs are making active efforts to minimize the significance of the concept of mutual and general security put forward by the Soviet Union. At the same time it meets with understanding and sympathy in the most diverse public, political, and scientific circles of the West. And there are many politicians who, although they hold ideological and social class positions different from ours, understand that the task of survival requires means and methods radically different from those demanded by a number of governments in power in Western countries and right-wing groups. In particular, there was profound interest in the proposal put forward by our country on reducing states' military arsenals to within the limits of a reasonable sufficiency in the foreseeable future. Submitting this principle fit in with the so-called alternative ideas of security that have recently been circulating widely in the West, ideas that are counterposed to the plans for the buildup of nuclear and conventional arms, "star wars," and so forth. Concepts like these, which envisage the renunciation of nuclear weapons, the prevention of an arms race in space, and radical quantitative and qualitative changes in conventional armed forces and armaments, have become widespread, for instance, in opposition political circles in Britain and the FRG, also in the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway.

The introduction of a new approach to international security is a prolonged and complex process, and in many respects a painful one. It requires an active struggle by all peace-loving and realistically minded forces and the revision of many dogmas and stereotypes that have grown up over decades and even centuries. But this is the only way to survive in the conditions of the growing interdependence of modern civilization and to ensure normal conditions for the functioning of the international community.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1479

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: COMMITTEE CALLS FOR WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

LD110611 Moscow TASS in English 0544 GMT 11 Jul 86

[Text] New York July 11 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov:

The Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference believes that the forum should be convened as soon as possible, says the annual report adopted by the participants in the committee's session, held here.

The document will be submitted for approval to the 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The delegates rejected the claims by the United States and its allies that it was "untimely" to convene the conference in the world situation they described as unfavourable.

It was precisely under these conditions, when the world was being swept increasingly deeper into the new dangerous spiral of the nuclear arms race, that the convocation of the conference was becoming ever more topical, said Czechoslovakia's representative Lubomir Doleja.

The delegation from Czechoslovakia, as well as those from other socialist countries believed that it was not the lack of questions the conference could and should handle which was the obstacle in the way of its convocation. The problem was the lack of political will on the part of the Western powers which hindered progress on principal disarmament issues.

The U.S. and its partners were in fact sabotaging the idea of convening the disarmament conference, observed the committee's members. No western delegate set out his government's view as to what should be done on this issue. This position proved that the imperialist powers intended to follow the course of building up nuclear arsenals, emphasised Wilhelm Grundmann of the German Democratic Republic.

The idea of holding an international conference on disarmament gained extensive international support, including at the United Nations, said the Soviet delegation's letter to the committee chairman, included into the annual report.

A representative forum could work out effective approaches towards restraining the arms race and achieving real disarmament and present practical solutions which all nations would undertake to implement.

The Soviet Union put forward lately exclusively important proposals on limiting the arms race, including its programme for a total elimination of nuclear weapons by the turn of the next millennium.

It was prepared to consider in a constructive spirit and without any pre-conditions any other proposals which might be advanced by NATO member countries, non-aligned and neutral nations.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1479

## RELATED ISSUES

### SOVIET REPORTS, COMMENTS ON MITTERRAND VISIT TO MOSCOW

#### Raimond Paris Press Conference

PM081347 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent report: "The Minister's Press Conference"]

[Text] Paris -- Answering your correspondent's questions at a meeting with journalists from the Diplomatic Press Association held in Paris, French External Relations Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond stated the following:

The forthcoming visit by French President Francois Mitterrand to the Soviet Union will provide an opportunity to examine very important international problems, including questions of disarmament and arms control, as well as the situation in various regions of the world.

The minister particularly noted the successful development of Franco-Soviet relations. In this connection he stressed that the Soviet Union and France hold consultations within the framework of various international forums, including the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. Dwelling on bilateral relations in the trade and economic sphere, he stated that in the course of the sessions of the Soviet-French "Grand Commission" held in 1985-1986 accords were reached which provide for the conclusion of major contracts.

The minister also noted the importance of Franco-Soviet cooperation in the sphere of science, technology, and culture and came out in favor of expanding it. The forthcoming Franco-Soviet summit talks in Moscow, J.-B. Raimond stressed, will be extremely useful both internationally and for the development of bilateral ties.

The French president, J.-B. Raimond went on, is in favor of further developing Franco-Soviet dialogue. This aim is served by the meeting of the two countries' leaders. The minister also expressed the hope that F. Mitterrand's visit to the USSR will give new impetus to bilateral consultations on the disarmament problem and help deepen Franco-Soviet economic and trade ties.

#### French Role in Disarmament

LD051657 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 5 Jul 86

["USSR - France: Developing Traditions of Friendship and Detente" ← TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS - TASS commentator Yuriy Maximov writes: The visit of President Francois Mitterrand of France to the Soviet Union which begins on Monday, the Soviet-French summit talks in Moscow take place at an exceptionally responsible period of world development [sentence as received]. The unceasing and escalating arms race instigated by the U.S. Administration, the threat of outer space militarization emanating from it, and Washington's refusal to comply with the SALT-2 treaty can only bring mankind still closer to the precipice of nuclear catastrophe.

To counter U.S. growing aggressiveness, the USSR put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress the programme of creating an all-embracing system of international security. New and concrete proposals were advanced also at the recent Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states. The point at issue is sizeable reduction in armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Not only the socialist countries have a stake in the realization of these initiatives. They likewise accord with the vital needs of the European capitalist countries, including France which can make a tangible contribution to enhancing security in Europe.

This is why, both powers have wide opportunities for pooling efforts in preserving peace on the European Continent. The rich experience in interaction in the interests of peace, security and cooperation accumulated by the USSR and France over many years furnishes proofs to this.

In the years of the Second World War, the peoples of our countries, fought shoulder to shoulder to crush Nazism and contributed towards establishing peace on European soil. In the subsequent years, the USSR and France blazed the trail to detente, substantially promoted progress of the Helsinki Conference and the elaboration of its final document. In so doing, they demonstrated the examples of new ideas and forms of the communication of states with different social systems. It is not in the interests of the European peoples to consign this experience to oblivion.

The visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to France in October 1985 became a remarkable milestone in improving the international situation and tapping new opportunities for carrying forward fruitful Soviet-French cooperation. It promoted the resumption of the East-West dialogue and accorded with the interests of universal security.

Without turning a blind eye to the sides' differences in the evaluation and approach to various international problems, one should have to bear in mind their mutual interest in ameliorating the international situation, consolidating peace in Europe and strategic stability in the world as a whole. This community of interests between the USSR and France will serve as a basis for carrying on mutually beneficial and versatile bilateral cooperation in the future as well.

#### SDI, INF, European Issues

PM061338 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[V. Gusenkov article: "Moscow-Paris: Favorable Preconditions"]

[Excerpt] As reported, President F. Mitterrand of France will soon be visiting the Soviet Union. The approaching Soviet-French talks are arousing great interest in the two countries. It goes without saying that the international community will be paying increased attention to them. Such interest and attention are no coincidence: Meetings between the top leaders of the USSR and France have always been an event in Soviet-French relations and produced a broad response in the world.



The latest meeting is a continuation, as it were, of the top-level dialogue -- a frank, constructive, and benevolent dialogue -- held in Paris last October during the visit to France by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Important accords were reached in the French capital aimed at activating bilateral cooperation between the Soviet Union and France and increasing their contribution to improving the international atmosphere.

Such a dialogue is particularly necessary at the present crucial stage in the development of international relations. The interests of peace insistently demand responsible, balanced decisions and actions from all states, primarily from the great powers, which include the Soviet Union and France. Soviet and French people are worried above all by problems of consolidating peace and international security. It is to be expected that due attention will be paid to these problems during the upcoming Soviet-French talks in Moscow. The CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th congress stressed the need for new thinking in the nuclear age, thinking that presupposes concern for the security of all states and takes account of the interests of all members of the international community and not just one's own security. The Soviet Union, guided by these principles, has proposed a realistic program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. Our country has put forward concrete initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race and securing a turn for the better in international affairs. The Soviet Union has held no nuclear tests for almost 1 year. It invites the United States above all and the other nuclear powers, including France, to follow its example.

The task of paramount importance is to prevent the spread of the nuclear arms race to space. During the Soviet-French summit in Paris a common understanding emerged that space must be barred to nuclear weapons. The USSR continues to determinedly oppose the siting of space-strike weapons. Judging from President F. Mitterrand's statements, France realizes the danger of extending the arms race to space. It is true that some people in France, including certain officials, say that nonparticipation in the "Strategic Defense Initiative" could lead to their country suffering a technological lag. They even claim that SDI has evolved toward being a harmless scientific research program without going as far as the creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons. These claims are eloquently refuted by the comments of U.S. Administration representatives and those people who have been assigned the task of forcing through the "star wars" program. Washington is clearly gambling on involving its allies in its dangerous plans to destabilize the international situation.

The problem of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe is imminent. It is well-known that our country submitted a draft agreement on this question at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. The agreement meets the U.S. position halfway. What is the French position on this? It is no secret that France possesses an impressive nuclear potential. The military program that it is carrying out envisages a considerable buildup and qualitative improvement of all components of the nuclear strike forces.

This means the construction of new missile-capable submarines, strategic aircraft, and tactical nuclear weapons. According to press information, the French nuclear forces are already capable of destroying hundreds of cities and killing tens of millions of people. Certain circles are bluntly speaking about where France's likely enemy is to be found. This is serious. The Soviet Union and its allies cannot fail to take that into account, of course. At the same time the USSR takes into account the specific nature of the French position in the North Atlantic alliance and shows a readiness to recognize its security interests. The new Soviet proposals on the table at the Geneva talks provide a way out of the deadlock on medium-range facilities in Europe. This requires some reciprocal compromise and a desire to seek mutually acceptable accords.



As leading European powers, the Soviet Union and France are interested in strengthening security on our continent. French statesmen support the lowering of the level of military confrontation in Europe. As for the USSR and its allies, they put forward at the Budapest conference some specific and extensive proposals on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in the zone from the Atlantic to the Urals. Talks on these proposals should be held, of course, not on a "bloc" basis but as part of the all-European process, whose principles were elaborated jointly by the USSR and France as well as by other European states when preparing the Helsinki CSCE. In this sphere, Moscow and Paris could work jointly or in parallel to achieve positive changes at the Stockholm conference. The USSR and France have already built up considerable positive experience of that work. USSR-French cooperation is also possible in the settlement of conflict situations in various regions and in the matter of enhancing the role and prestige of the United Nations in strengthening international peace and security.

The fact that the Soviet Union and France belong to opposing sociopolitical systems and different alliances has meant that the reasons for their actions in the international arena have not always been identical. They view international events differently and hold different positions on particular problems. At the same time there is a common factor here: namely, an interest in overcoming the present dangerous development of events, strengthening strategic stability, and maintaining military equilibrium at the lowest level possible. That interest creates favorable preconditions for increasing the efforts aimed at turning away from confrontation toward peaceful cooperation among states.

#### Meets Gorbachev 7 July

LD071815 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 7 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic, had a meeting in the Kremlin today.

They continued their political dialogue initiated in Paris last year on the major problems of the world situation, which remains tense and calls for relaxation.

Mikhail Gorbachev presented to Francois Mitterrand basic causes [as relieved] of Soviet foreign policy at the present stage and explained the latest proposals and steps for the normalization of the international situation.

The sides reviewed arguments concerning the causes of the present-day situation and attached special attention to the problems of ending the arms race. They expressed the confidence that changes for the better were possible in that area as well. Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the hope that the constructive role of France in world affairs would contribute to such a change.

The conversation, the importance of which both leaders noted, was interesting and instructive and passed in the spirit of sincerity and desire for mutual understanding that is characteristic of Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand, and in the atmosphere of high responsibility for European and international security and for the condition of Soviet-French relations that is vested in the leaders of the two countries.

Exchanges of opinion will be continued with the mutual understanding that they will help achieve concrete positive results.

'Spirit of Sincerity'

LD071931 Moscow TASS in English 1916 GMT 7 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS -- The first meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic, in the Kremlin today passed in a spirit of sincerity and striving for mutual understanding, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. The political dialogue initiated in Paris last year on the cardinal problems of the world situation, which remains tense and calls for detente, was resumed at the talks during the official visit of the French president to the Soviet Union. The conversation, the importance of which was noted by both leaders, was interesting and instructive, Gennadiy Gerasimov said. It passed in an atmosphere of that high responsibility for European and international security and for the condition of Soviet-French relations that is vested in the leaders of both countries.

The sides considered the causes of the current situation and attached special importance to problems of ending the arms race. The confidence was voiced at the meeting that changes for the better were possible in that field. Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the hope that France's constructive role in world affairs would contribute to such changes. He presented to Francois Mitterrand the principled motivation of Soviet foreign policy and substantiated the latest Soviet proposals and steps for the normalization of the international situation.

Exchanges of opinion will be continued with the mutual understanding that they will help achieve concrete positive results, the head of the Information Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR said in conclusion.

[Paris AFP in English at 0723 GMT on 8 July reports the following: "Journalist Gennadiy Gerasimov, 56, has taken over as the Soviet Foreign Ministry's information chief, in time for a four-day official visit by French President Francois Mitterrand which began Monday. He succeeds Vladimir Lomeyko, who is ill in hospital but would still work for the ministry, officials said. Mr. Lomeyko is close to Anatoliy Gromyko, son of President -- and former long-serving foreign minister -- Andrey Gromyko. Mr. Gerasimov, U.S. correspondent of the NOVOSTI news agency between 1972 and 1978, has been editor-in-chief for the last two years of the weekly MOSCOW NEWS, published in six languages for foreigners. Mr. Gerasimov's new department has been upgraded as part of a current Foreign Ministry reorganisation. According to reliable sources, Mr. Lomeyko had declined an offered post as ambassador to Sweden."]

Gorbachev Dinner Speech 7 July

LD071754 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 7 Jul 86

["Mikhail Gorbachev's Speech at Dinner in Honour of Francois Mitterrand" -- TASS headline]

[Excerpt] Moscow July 7 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet today gave in the Grand Kremlin Palace a dinner in honour of President of the French Republic Francois Mitterrand and his wife.

Present at the dinner together with the president were French statesmen and politicians accompanying him on his trip.

General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev delivered a speech at the dinner. He said:

Esteemed Mr. President and Mme Mitterrand,

Ladies and gentlemen,

Comrades,

We are glad to receive in Moscow the president of the French Republic and his wife, members of the French Government, distinguished representatives of friendly France. The warm welcome accorded to us in Paris by the residents of the French capital, the businesslike and candid conversations with the president, with other statesmen and politicians are fresh in our memory.

I would like your present visit to Moscow to be memorable and interesting to you, to enable you to feel what is uppermost in the minds of Soviet people, what are their plans and hopes at this crucial moment of society's development. The essence of the strategy of the 27th CPSU Congress is to bring into play the entire social, economic and democratic potential of socialism, to give the necessary impetus to our development and improve the people's wellbeing. We have advanced bold plans and we are embarking on vast work, abandoning what is outmoded or has not justified itself. We are trying out new methods and looking for solutions that accord with the nature of the present-day tasks.

The whole country has been put into motion. The readiness of Soviet people to give their talent, abilities, knowledge, experience and energy to the common cause remind us of the most stirring moments in the history of our state.

The implementation of our plans is conceivable in conditions of peace. Hence the general line in international affairs: to do everything for the consolidation of peace, for the ending of the arms race.

By concrete steps, proposals and unilateral actions, the Soviet Union is showing its will to alter the dangerous course of events, to ensure that distrust and animosity be, at last, replaced with sensible cooperation based on awareness of the common responsibility for the fate of the world.

I have already said more than once that we are not going to convert anyone to our faith. Neither do we strive to be winners on the diplomatic "chessboard". Detente must be the aim of present-day diplomacy. And durable, mature detente is a benefit for all.

This applies above all to Europe for it is not only nuclear war that is of mortal danger to it. There are more than 150 atomic reactors, hundreds of chemical plants on European territory. Just a few conventional artillery shells are enough to destroy a reactor and take the toll of many lives. Whatever the variant, conventional or nonconventional, an armed conflict would trigger off a world catastrophe.

Everybody sees that Europeans are sick and tired of nerve-racking confrontation and tension. They need the air of detente. The seriousness of the international situation, the ripening of the threat of war are realized with particular acuteness here, in Europe. For it is exactly in Europe that powerful military groups oppose each other, whole "mont Blancs" of arms have been accumulated, new nuclear missiles are being

deployed. On the other hand, it is in Europe that valuable experience of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, either members of military alliances or neutral, has been accumulated.

Europe's economic and political potential is large enough for it to speak more definitely and confidently on its own behalf, to press for progress at all the ongoing talks.

It is necessary to rid political thinking of viewing Europe as a "theatre of operations". Europe must set an example of the coexistence of sovereign, different, but peaceful states, states aware of their interdependence and building their relations on trust.

The main road to this passes through ridding Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- of the explosive burden of armaments. Jointly with its allies, the USSR recently advanced major proposals for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. This makes it possible to really eradicate fears, hypocritical and actual, that the elimination of nuclear arms in the European Continent would tip the balance in favour of socialist countries, which, allegedly, have an edge in conventional armaments.

Let us approach all this in a new way: Let the West make appropriate reductions in those types of arms of which it has more, while we shall not hesitate to eliminate the "surplus" of those types of arms of which we have more. In other words let us look for a balance at a lower level. This task is realistic and pressing and we have a right to expect a positive and concrete response of the West.

Though Europe is called "the old world", a sense of the new, sensitivity to historic changes is inherent in it. This was manifested in the emergence of a unique phenomenon which is described as the European process, "the spirit of Helsinki". It has stood the first tests and continues serving stability and peace in Europe.

This process must be conducted along all directions -- the political, economic, humanitarian and cultural. All the "three (Helsinki) baskets" must be filled with fresh and useful fruit. Such is our approach also to the coming forum of importance in the life of Europe -- the meeting in Vienna of representatives of states -- participants in the European conference. We believe that that meeting might signify a turn for the better. And we are ready to promote this. We would like to count in this on interaction with France, with other countries.

But the first stage of the Stockholm conference is to end before the Vienna meeting starts. The situation there gives rise to concern. Little time is left. All participants should have long since manifested a responsible approach and flexibility. It is only serious mutual concessions on the basis of equality and equal security that can ensure success. The Soviet Union and France that were at the source of the Stockholm forum could reach agreement already now as to how to promote this.

The theme of human rights becomes ever more acute on the threshold of the 21st century. People refuse to tolerate arbitrariness and lawlessness within their countries and in international relations. And this is profoundly natural for this reflects the level reached by civilization. We approach this matter with the highest criteria both as a problem of the embodiment of advanced ideals of social justice and as one of the components of the all-embracing system of security. This was said at the 27th congress.



Mitterrand Dinner Speech 7 July

PM100808 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 86 First Edition p 2

[TASS report on French President F. Mitterrand's speech at 7 July Kremlin dinner in his honor]

[Excerpt] Mr General Secretary!

Mrs Gorbachev!

Gentlemen!

Less than a year ago I had the honor to receive you in Paris on your first trip to a Western country since your appointment. In response to the invitation extended to me by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium it is with great pleasure and interest that I am here today in Moscow in the Hall of Facets -- this sumptuous embodiment of the brilliance of your civilization.

I thank you for the opportunity given me to continue the dialogue which we have established and to which I adhere because I consider it necessary for the good of our peoples and useful for the development of events in the world, for which the Soviet Union and France each bear responsibility.

This dialogue is conditioned not merely by current political interests. It rests on longstanding traditions and 1,000 years of history, during which we have never lost sight of each other, and our sympathies and mutual inclinations have triumphed over crises and conflicts, culminating in the brotherhood-in-arms at a time when our independence was at stake.

Our cultures have much in common. This fall the "France-Russia, a Century of Enlightenment" exhibition, which Muscovites will see in their turn in 1987, opens in Paris. It covers the period when Diderot was working in St. Petersburg on a "plan for a university for the Russian Government" at the request of Catherine the Great. Many current discussions about concepts such as the homeland, Europe, and human rights were brilliantly anticipated in the work of the philosophers of that time, and nobody has since surpassed their conclusions.

Mr General Secretary, I know the interest you have in Europe -- this historic and cultural community; in this respect our views wholly coincide, even if our continent looks different from the Atlantic seaboard than it does from the Urals. Europe must really become once again a main character in its own history in order to fully play its role as a factor of equilibrium and stability in international relations.

France has spared no effort to ensure that Europe, thanks to the maintenance of peace, again acquired the conditions for developing in the diversity which is the essence of its creative genius. The Franco-German reconciliation -- made even more necessary as a result of the destruction caused by the war and in accordance with the interests of both peoples ever since democracy was restored on the ruins of nazism -- marked the first phase of this process. The creation of the European Community, which initially united 6 countries and now 12, is the second phase of this initiative. But the community which we are creating does not intend to turn in on itself.

It must play an active role, it must also contribute to developing the security of our continent as a whole, whose destiny it attentively monitors.

We believe that the 35 countries represented at Helsinki made progress in ultimately reaching agreement on a number of principles and specific provisions. However, it is still necessary for the jointly agreed measures to be implemented increasingly extensively and for the work that has been begun to continue.

I have already told you, Mr. General Secretary, that France is a country proud of its independence. While remaining true to its allies and observing the commitments it has undertaken, it strives to maintain its independence by making decisions which commit it to talking the same language with everyone. France is a peace-loving country. Its policy in the defense sphere is aimed exclusively at deterring anyone who would wish to invade it. And my duty is to keep watch to see that we are invariable strong enough to meet that goal. I have already had the opportunity in a talk with you, Mr. General Secretary, to clarify our views on disarmament questions. Through its important initiatives in the past and its active work in the various disarmament forums in which it participates, France has demonstrated the consistency of its intentions in this area. It is guided in these intentions by concern both to reduce excessive weapons arsenals and to safeguard the security of all states.

Lacking the possibility to build security on the basis of trust, which we strive to strengthen, we have been forced to base it on equilibrium of forces. We could at least make progress down this road if arms were balanced at a lower level than today.

That is why, as a nonparticipant, France has been following with great attention the progress in the talks which your country started with the United States in Geneva. I want both great powers to arrive at specific and significant results in accordance with the responsibility they bear. You know, Mr. General Secretary, that my country does not intend to let anyone else determine the level of its forces. Our nuclear deterrent, which is the foundation of our independence and security, is based on a limited arsenal which, however, is adequate for our strategy. Speaking at the United Nations in 1983, I set out -- and 2 years ago, in a speech here, recalled -- the conditions on which our possible consent to participate at some point in nuclear arms talks would depend. Those conditions have not changed.

France also attentively follows questions concerning space. It states that the utilization of space for military purposes has already become a reality, but it considers it essentially important to avoid any kind of new arms race whatsoever. Better to give peace every chance than to cross yet another threshold into endless escalation. Everything that I am saying here applies to each of the great partners which hold the fate of the world in their hands.

I was interested to acquaint myself with the conventional arms reductions proposals which you expounded 18 April and which were again put forward in the Budapest Appeal. I see in them a desire to take account of the concern which I referred to earlier. Equilibrium of forces is indeed an indivisible concept. It would be artificial to isolate nuclear weapons while allowing destabilizing inequalities to remain in the sphere of conventional and chemical arms. France, which was in at the birth of the Conference on Disarmament in Europe, would like that conference, in accordance with its mandate, to lead to the adoption in Stockholm of a number of significant confidence-building measures which would be a promising preliminary condition in the future of the next phase of arms reduction.

But if we bear responsibility for disarmament, we are no less accountable for the all too numerous conflicts which continue to make our planet run with blood.



### Mitterrand Meets With Gromyko

LD081806 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 8 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, had a meeting in the Kremlin today with Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic.

Andrey Gromyko stressed that the Soviet state was pursuing an energetic foreign policy and seeking an improvement in the international climate and a turn for the better in world and European affairs. The special importance of the Soviet initiatives was noted in that context, first and foremost of a concrete goal the Soviet Union had offered the international community, namely, the complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by the end of the current century.

Just as during the meetings between the French president and Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the Soviet side expressed the conviction that mankind had no more important task today than the task of averting the threat of nuclear war, ending the arms race and achieving disarmament.

On his part, Francois Mitterrand pointed to the constructive nature of the Soviet Union's proposals for the elimination of nuclear and conventional armaments and expressed the wish that these proposals be discussed actively during appropriate talks.

Both sides declared that the Soviet-French political dialogue and the further development of ties will be promoting the strengthening of mutual confidence and friendship of the two peoples, the consolidation of European and international security. This is the aim also of the exchange of opinions during the current visit of the French president to the Soviet Union.

The conversation passed in the atmosphere of sincerity and striving for mutual understanding.

Taking part in the conversation from the Soviet side were First Vice-President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Petr Demichev, USSR Ambassador to France Yakov Ryabov and other officials. Taking part in the conversation from the French side were French Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond, French Ambassador to the USSR Yves Pagniez, other officials.

### Mitterrand Meets Gorbachev 8 July

LD081531 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 8 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand continued their one-on-one talks in the Kremlin today.

The two leaders thoroughly analysed the international situation, which is worrying, primarily because of the lack of progress towards ending the arms race.

Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed that the Soviet leadership, seeking solutions to problems and an improvement in the situation, should continue to act constructively and in a responsible manner and was prepared to accept well-grounded compromises on the basis of equal security of the sides. It expects a similar approach from its negotiating partners.

The sides exchanged opinions on the attitude of the Western countries towards the proposals on reductions in conventional armaments and armed forces put forward by the Warsaw treaty countries. Discussing opportunities for an agreement on the elimination of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe, the sides touched on the French forces in the overall nuclear balance.

Mikhail Gorbachev informed his interlocutor of problems related to the accident at the Chernobyl Atomic Power Station. The sides voice their shared interest in bilateral and international cooperation to ensure safety in nuclear power engineering.

The instructive and frank conversation in the spirit of good faith reiterated the great importance of personal contacts between the leaders of the two countries for an improvement in the international climate and for expanding the overall potential of Soviet-French cooperation.

#### Soviet MFA Press Conference

LD081814 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 8 Jul 86

[Excerpt] Moscow 8 July TASS--Soviet and foreign journalists were briefed at the press centre of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR today on the progress of the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Francois Mitterrand, president of the French republic. Both sides, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry said, voiced worry over the situation in the international relations today.

The sides agreed that a search was needed for new approaches to the existing problems, approaches based on a sense of realism, in order to rectify the existing situation, alarming first and foremost because of the lack of progress towards ending the arms race.

The Soviet side stressed that the arms race, regrettably, was going on and that there was the risk of it reaching the point of no return, Gerasimov continued. The USSR has already put forward quite a few initiatives. Looking for ways of improving the situation, the Soviet Union will continue to act constructively and to display readiness to accept well-grounded compromises with due regard for the equal security of the sides. It expects a similar approach from its negotiating partners.

Discussing opportunities for reaching an agreement on the elimination of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe, the problem of the French forces in the overall nuclear balance was raised.

The Soviet side supplied information on problems related to the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station. The question of cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy was discussed.

Today Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, had a meeting with Jean-Bernard Raimond, minister of external relations of France, Gerasimov said. The sides discussed international and European problems and various aspects of East-West relations. The Soviet side noted the need for energetic efforts successfully to complete the Stockholm conference.

Mitterrand TV Address 9 July

LD091921 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jul 86

[Address by French President Francois Mitterrand in Moscow, Mitterrand speaking in French with superimposed Russian translation -- live or recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Dear Soviet friends. This is the second time that I have been given an opportunity to speak directly to you on television. I value this opportunity all the more in that I speak to you on the eve of 14 July which, as you probably know, is France's national holiday, but also something of a holiday for all the people of Europe and the world.

Since my trip to your country 2 years ago much has changed in France, the USSR, and the world. In my view, however, the most important things remain. I would like to tell you what the most important things for us, French people, are. Yes, the most important thing for France is, first, to be a modern country, a nation which has resolutely embarked on the path of progress, and in all spheres -- science and technology -- and this entails numerous consequences.

To give just this example, France is the third world power in the world [as heard] as far as space is concerned. It cooperates with your country in this sphere. Its researchers and technicians are among the most advanced in the world. And also in other spheres -- spheres as varied as information science, medicine, new types of energy and nuclear energy. We do not strive for progress as an end in itself. Progress must have a human significance. Therefore we want this progress to serve the prosperity of the people, we want every French person to have equal opportunities with everyone else in life.

For France, the most important thing is to be an open country, one that wishes to be open to everything that happens in the world, open to new ideas, open to the values of others, to your values. France is a country in which all philosophical, political, and religious convictions can freely develop and express themselves. Such is the nature of our political system. Of course, nothing is perfect.

Much has yet to be done, and we have to be careful to move correctly along the path we have chosen. I would add that this openness is based on constant exchange with the outside world, which corresponds to our old, ancient traditions, of which we are proud.

The most important thing for France is to be an independent country, and you in the Soviet Union should understand that word. True to its alliances and loyal to its commitments, France remains the mistress of its own decisions. It is, of course, making considerable efforts in armed forces. At the same time, it wants the forces of both East and West to be reduced, to the lowest possible level, and it is doing everything to achieve that goal. And that was the subject of the very useful talk that I have just had with Mr General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. France has based its relations with the Soviet Union on friendship and mutual interest. We know all that we have to gain from that friendship because the peoples of both our countries have achieved a very great deal in the field of advanced economics and research.

We know what we are talking about because we are of importance. We have a thousand-year-old Christian tradition, and this country is the land of Peter the Great, the builder of new cities. We are divided by differing political philosophies and concepts in many fields. We do not belong to the same alliances, that is obvious. But we are united by

a common history, the memory of the terrible trials endured together during world war II. We have a common sense of tremendous responsibility for the defense of peace, and we Frenchmen cannot forget what we are obliged to the Soviet people for: its soldiers, who heroically fought during the last world war. We possess a whole range of mutual attractions and influences between our cultures, and therefore we know each other well and this should continue. It is my sincere desire that these exchanges between French and Soviet people should develop more and more. This is a real additional guarantee of peace.

Dear Soviet friends, I greet you on behalf of France. I want to thank you, and through you to thank your leaders, for the very warm reception which you have given, in my person, to the whole French people. Thank you and goodbye.

'Mutual Understanding'

LD091503 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 9 Jul 86

[Victor Glazunov Commentary]

[Text] President Francois Mitterrand of France is in the third day of his official visit to the Soviet Union. Viktor Glazunov comments.

The Soviet Union and France were the countries which initiated the process of easing tensions. Now when the world situation has sharply aggravated, the Soviet-French summit is expected to yield fresh incentives for a relaxation of tensions and disarmament. The top level talks in Moscow are characterized by mutual understanding and a feeling of high responsibility for European and world security. This is a hopeful sign. As for the USSR, in the search for the ways to gain solutions and improve the current state of affairs, it will continue to display constructiveness, responsibility, and willingness to reach the necessary compromises in the pursuit of equal security. This has been stressed in the course of talks. However, its partners should display a similar approach in order to ensure success in this undertaking.

Participants in the Soviet-French negotiations are focusing on the situation in Europe because European security is a decisive factor of international security. The lessons of history must not be forgotten. Both world wars began in Europe. In the meantime Washington is given to viewing Europe as a possible theater of military actions, including actions with the use of nuclear weapons, and this is very disquieting. The Soviet Union views Europe as the common home of all Europeans, which should be safeguarded against a holocaust at all costs.

But is this possible? Of course it is if the continent is freed from millions of troops and from the enormous stockpiles of weapons. The Soviet Union advanced a program for gradually scrapping nuclear weaponry. It put forward concrete proposals which provide for removing medium-range nuclear missiles from Europe and for reducing conventional arms and troops from the Atlantic to the Ural mountains. In a letter to the United Nations secretary general the Soviet foreign minister suggested steps aimed at turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace. This country is prepared to

consider constructive proposals from the other side. The main thing required now is to display political will, (?a) sense of responsibility (?and) simply common sense because the question raised by the realities of our nuclear era is inexorable, to be or not to be. And (?a) solution (?s) to this question should not be entrusted to somebody else. Europe should have a say in this matter.

#### French Spokeswoman Cited

LD092124 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 9 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 9 July (TASS)--Today's talks between President Francois Mitterrand of France and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev were very substantive and encompassed a wide range of problems, it was stated by the official spokeswoman of the Elysee Palace Michele Gendreau-Massaloux when addressing here a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

These talks, she added, were marked by the spirit of an open exchange of views and were of a candid nature.

The sides studied a number of important political questions, in particular devoted attention to Europe's role in world development. The Soviet Union and France declared for an invigoration of the work of the Stockholm Conference and its resultative completion.

The participants in the talks discussed problems of developing Franco-Soviet trade relations, noting the existence of big untapped possibilities in this field.

When speaking about scientific and technical ties between France and the Soviet Union in various fields Michele Gendreau-Massaloux described them as "excellent".

The visit by the head of the French Republic to the USSR was an interesting one, she added. The dialogue between France and the USSR is not ending, Michele Gendreau-Massaloux stressed.

#### Soviet Spokesman Cited

LD091950 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 9 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists held today at the press centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs dealt with the concluding meetings within the framework of the Soviet-French summit dialogue.

In the opinion of the Soviet side, the characteristic feature of the present talks was the concern for the destinies of the world, said Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. These talks can give a good impetus to a positive development of international relations. According to G. Gerasimov the main attention at the talks was devoted to the following problem: How, after all, to put an end to the arms race?



According to the Soviet estimate, the sides agreed at the talks that the world situation tended to deteriorate, and that efforts should be exerted both in the East and in the West in order to find ways towards the normalization of relations.

If the Soviet Union and France interact, act jointly or in a parallel way in order to turn the international relations towards the discontinuation of the arms race, the whole world will gain from it. The Soviet leadership proceeds from the assumption that this is our common task. It highly appreciates the contribution of France, the spokesman of the USSR foreign Ministry said. The positions of the sides on many problems were similar, and sometimes they agreed about the goal, having in mind various ways of attaining it.

According to Gennadiy Gerasimov, the Soviet side will seek to prevent the reduction of the volume of trade and will draw up its own proposals. He pointed out that concrete negotiations were under way on increasing the purchases of French equipment. The USSR raised the question of a possibility to expand cooperation and create enterprises in the Soviet Union on a licence basis.

G. Gerasimov said that in the sphere of scientific cooperation the sides had raised questions dealing with the computerization of education, some technical questions connected with a new joint space flight, as well as those connected with nuclear power engineering.

#### Mitterrand Press Conference on TV

LD101708 Moscow Television in Russian 1445 GMT 10 Jul 86

[Press conference by French President Francois Mitterrand at the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow on 10 July; Mitterrand speaks in French with superimposed Russian translation -- recorded; journalists not identified.]

[Text] [Mitterrand] Ladies and gentlemen, the holding of this press conference was envisaged long ago. It was included in the official program of my visit to the Soviet Union, and so I think there is no need for any introduction, as everyone knows what is concerned. If I were to try and enumerate to you everything that has happened during the course of these 3 days, I would only say what you already know. Therefore, I will stress once more that they were 3 well-filled days. They were occupied mainly with talks with Mr Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and also with Messrs Gromyko and Ryzhkov. At the same time, French ministers had meetings with corresponding Soviet ministers. All these meetings were imbued with content, and this gives me the opportunity to reply in detail to your questions. And so I am listening to you and ready to let you have the floor.

[Journalist, in French with superimposed Russian translation] How do you appraise the prospects of the holding of a summit meeting between President Reagan and Mr Gorbachev?

[Mitterrand] I believe both sides want a meeting. That is the psychological and political reality. I have gained the impression from my conversation with Mr. Gorbachev that both sides want this meeting. However, quite a few obstacles still exist and therefore, it is still too early to say when this meeting will take place. [Mitterrand is heard to say in French at this point: "to say today whether it will take place and when it will take place."]



[Journalist, in French with superimposed Russian translation] Mr. President, in your conversations with Mr. Gorbachev were any common positions revealed on questions of disarmament?

[Mitterrand] First of all, I would like to say that one should not confuse the exchange of opinions of the sides during state visits with official negotiations. I did not come here to conduct negotiations. The facts which I gleaned during the meetings that took place are extremely interesting and useful and open up a wide field for thought. The results of the conversations with Mr. Gorbachev gave me no little food for thought. Now I must think all of this over carefully and discuss it with the appropriate competent organs. It is quite probable that all of this might lead to the formulation of some concrete proposals. France has never avoided resolving important questions. However, I repeat, one should not confuse two different types of activity. I did not come here to conduct negotiations. We only received certain preliminary outlines and indications. France has the highest degree of interest in resolving questions of disarmament and cannot remain indifferent while they are being resolved. It is a question only of the form of the participation, and where to start from. There are very many proposals in this respect. In particular, the Soviet side, and Mr. Gorbachev personally, have put forward truly sensational proposals recently. They can be evaluated in different ways. But these proposals exist.

They concern nuclear weapons as a whole, strategic nuclear forces, medium-range nuclear forces, and also conventional types of weapons and chemical weapons. There are still many areas where much remains to be done but I have listed just the main ones.

[Journalist, in French with superimposed Russian translation] Mr President, during your talks with Mr. Gorbachev did you not get the impression that the USSR is ready to move along a more concrete and positive path in the sphere of East-West relations?

[Mitterrand] I would like to say that, today more than ever before, Mr. Gorbachev seems to me an extremely modern man, a man of his time. He approaches the resolution of problems in the form in which they exist today in 1986. Of course, he is guided by certain concepts and a certain view of the world. But the whole world as it exists in 1986 will change in the future and it requires a definition of what it will be like in the future. One can emphasize the possibility of detente but one can also emphasize the possibility of detente but one can also emphasize the probability of the outbreak of war.

All these possibilities are also permanently present today; they are constantly existing and are a constant reality. Realization of the fact that the arms race damages all, even those who extract material profit from it, belongs to the range of such realities. I would like to reiterate that Mr. Gorbachev seems to me a man of our times who is perfectly aware of the basic realities of the world and of the need to direct human and economic resources at achieving the results which would serve the common good, the common flourishing and development, instead of being spent for some other purposes. The Soviet Union's position is in favor of disarmament. Nevertheless, the USSR is a country which is well-armed and capable of developing most sophisticated varieties of weapons. And until we overcome the difference of the present period, we ought to take that into account. The Soviet Union does take it into account and every country will do the same.

[Simak] Stefan Simak, Czechoslovak Radio. As we know, a great deal of attention at the talks was paid to issues of European security. Mr President, what is your attitude toward the new initiatives of the Warsaw Pact countries which were announced in Budapest?

[Mitterrand] France not only participates in the Stockholm conference, but it has come forward as one of the initiators of such talks. All this bears witness to the interest which is paid by it to issues of European security. Without neglecting the interests of its partners throughout the world and the interests of its closest friends in the framework of the European Community -- its allies -- France has joined in dialogue with the Soviet Union. This is a very important and fundamental dialogue in which France has a historic privilege. Participation in the European Conferences on Security and Cooperation is an important cause which is permanently monitored by French diplomats, those who are in charge of this field in our political activities. We have been briefed on the wishes and intentions of the Soviet side in this respect, just as the Soviet Union is well aware of the intentions and wishes of France. From this point of view, in my opinion, the Budapest proposals are part of the Soviet peace proposals which I regard as very interesting.

This does not mean at all, however, that everything that is being proposed is accepted by France as something unconditional. Without question we are for negotiations, we are for the attainment of accords between our countries, but in the course of the forthcoming negotiations and heated discussions the details will naturally have to be finalized and the positions determined.

[Journalist] Mr President, you have spoken to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev about the fate and prospects of SALT-II. What view did the French side voice?

[Mitterrand] The French side simply voiced the wish that the existing treaties -- at whatever stage of diplomatic finalization they are, and I particularly have in mind SALT-II should be observed without fail. Since our intention is disarmament, there is no point in going in the direction of superarmament. When it comes to treaties, one should set out with the intention of consolidating what has been achieved, not destroying it.

And now, if I may, I should like to conclude our work. But I should first like to say a few words about the French delegation's stay in Moscow.

I already visited Moscow 2 years ago. Since then, I have received Mr Gorbachev in Paris. Even then considerable progress was made in achieving mutual understanding and a desire to make progress along the road of improving our bilateral relations. It was also planned to continue the search for a solution to international problems. As far as bilateral relations are concerned, there are very many opportunities here -- they include trade and all the other types of cooperation. From meeting to meeting, we are seeing increasingly significant and consistent progress being established in our relations.

However, I would not like this press conference to come to an end without having the opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to the Soviet leadership and to General Secretary Gorbachev for the reception given to us, and in our person, to France. For all of us and for me personally, this holds great hopes. Everything that has been said by us here was said to the point and directly. We are the allies of our allies. We are not lone pilgrims engaging in the examination of questions relating to equal balance in the world. We are devoted to our distinctive character and take into account the fact that we are representatives of Europe. We have specific historical experience of links with the Russia of the past, just as with the Soviet Union. This experience covers many centuries and is woven into the canvas of our history. We consider that we should preserve the tradition of our active relations. On the one hand, it is a question of solidarity with our allies, and on the other, of the individual identity and independent policy of France, which is striving to observe its interests.

4 August 1986

We are profoundly satisfied with the meetings in Moscow and express words of gratitude for the cordiality and hospitality shown toward us, and also for the open and deepened nature of the conversations which took place. In our view, it is precisely that which opens up prospects for the future and allows us to think that from one year to the next France and the Soviet Union will deepen and multiply not only points of contact, but also mutual cooperation. [applause]

#### U.S., French Reaction Cited

PM100934 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[PRAVDA/TASS report: "Dialogue in the Name of Peace"]

[Excerpts] The beginning in Moscow of Soviet-French top-level talks and the speeches exchanged at a Kremlin dinner by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and President F. Mitterrand of the French Republic are being widely commented on by the mass information media in various countries. Television and radio broadcasts and press reports note that the political dialogue begun last year in Paris on cardinal problems of the international situation, which remains tense and needs to be improved, is being continued in Moscow, which persistently and purposefully works to preserve and strengthen peace. Publications by foreign mass information organs draw particular attention to the fact that the meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand are proceeding in the characteristic spirit of sincerity and a desire for mutual understanding, and in an atmosphere of the great responsibility for European and international security and for the state of Soviet-French relations that rests with the leaders of the two countries.

France: The Soviet Union is guided in its foreign policy not by military interests but by the desire to hold talks whose aim is to conclude agreements aimed at ending the arms race, LE MONDE points out. It stresses that Paris welcomes the USSR's efforts to impart a more active nature to the process of stabilizing peace and security.

In his speech the CPSU Central Committee general secretary stressed that Europe is expected to set an example of cohabitation [sozhitelstvo] by sovereign, different, but peace-loving states aware of their interdependence and basing their relations on trust, L'HUMANITE writes. Together with its allies, the USSR recently put forward major proposals on reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, which makes it possible to demolish fears — hypocritical and deliberate — that the elimination of nuclear weapons on the continent would supposedly tilt the balance in favor of the socialist countries, which are allegedly superior in conventional arms. In this connection the Soviet leader urged that equilibrium be sought at a lower level, noting that this task is realistic and urgent and that the USSR has a right to hope for a positive and specific response from the West.

Reporting on the start of Soviet-French top-level talks, French Television Channel 1 describes the atmosphere as good and points out that the USSR greets the arrival of the French president with satisfaction and expects that the further development of Soviet-French political dialogue and mutually profitable cooperation will help to establish detente and strengthen peace in Europe and international security. [passage omitted]

The United States: The Soviet leader said that Europe must not be regarded as a "theater of military operations" and, as it has accumulated valuable experience in peaceful

coexistence between states with different social systems, it is expected to set an example of such cohabitation [sozhitelstvo]. THE NEW YORK TIMES reports. The WASHINGTON POST correspondent in Moscow says: The Soviet leader has urged a renewal of detente in Europe, which would seem to signify a new Soviet diplomatic offensive; he urged that new life be breathed into the all-European process begun in Helsinki.

[Paragraph continues] For his part the French president stressed the need for Europe to once again really become the main character in its own history so that it can play its own role to the full as a factor of balance and stability in international relations.

Despite the fact that the United States, the Soviet leader said, torpedoed the opportunity to coordinate positions on human contacts at the Bern conference, Moscow is ready to be guided in practice by the Bern draft, although it has not been formally approved due to opposition from the United States, the ASSOCIATED PRESS agency states. [passage omitted]

#### Politburo Discussion

PM131411 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 86 First Edition p 1

[At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpts] At a meeting held on 11 July, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined the results of the development of the country's economy in the first half of 1986.

The Politburo approved the results of the talks and conversations of the Soviet leadership with Francois Mitterrand, president of France. It was noted that at the present crucial juncture in European and world development, the Soviet-French political summit dialogue assumes an even greater significance as a factor for improving the international situation, strengthening trust between states, intensifying the pan-European process, and creating an international security system. The talks in Moscow on all aspects of Soviet-French relations make it possible to enhance the effectiveness of mutually advantageous cooperation in the trade, economic, scientific-technical, and cultural fields.

#### Agreement on ABM, SALT

LD131946 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 13 Jul 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Hello, comrades! Last week President Francois Mitterrand of France visited our country. To assess the significance of the visit at its true worth, one should take a look at it from the perspective of the past, the present, and the future.

From the past perspective, our country and France are bound by long-standing traditions of active relations. For example, one can speak of a certain attraction our countries have in the cultural field. The present visit by the distinguished French guest adds to the groundwork of history, and this includes recent history, inasmuch as it was the Soviet Union and France who began the process of detente together.

From the present perspective, the visit was important to determine positions and tasks for the current moment, which is not just a current one, but rather a crucial one, inasmuch as the question of "Whither the World" is being solved: toward a development of political dialogue or towards an exacerbation of military confrontation. And here the significance of the Soviet-French meeting from the viewpoint of the future becomes obvious, as well as from the viewpoint of the solution of the main task: an end to the arms race. If the Soviet Union and France act jointly, or in parallel, at least, to halt this race, to turn it back, then everybody will feel better in this world. The Soviet Union and France feel that it is important not to wreck the existing accords, which to a certain extent impede the arms race. First of all, what I have in mind is the ABM Treaty; there is also SALT II -- it places quantitative limits on nuclear arsenals. It is also important not to spread the arms race to other spheres, i.e. space. Here the Soviet Union and France agree. We do have differences; as the French president said, France has not stepped off its square on the international chessboard. But the Soviet side had not been reckoning on this, and, as Francois Mitterrand added, the game can be played in different ways; and in Moscow, on the search for paths to peace, our countries found this common language.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1478



4 August 1986

## RELATED ISSUES

## SHEVARDNADZE MESSAGE TO UN CHIEF ON MEDITERRANEAN

PM101256 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

["Text" of letter by Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, to UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar on 8 July]

[Text] Esteemed Mr Secretary General,

In the present-day complex and tense international situation it is necessary that practical actions be urgently taken to ensure by joint effort of states a turn for the better, to start movement towards creating a dependable comprehensive system of international security to embrace all regions of the world. All foreign policy actions of the Soviet Union, its approach to international problems including the problem of ensuring security in the Mediterranean are prompted by the striving for accomplishing this task in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

The Soviet Union has on more than one occasion called the attention of the international community, including also at the highest political level, to the abnormal situation that is taking shape in that densely-populated region. It has actually been turned into an arena of military confrontation, is overflowed with armaments, including the most destructive ones -- nuclear armaments.

The reasons for this are well-known: they directly follow from the U.S. policy of "neo-globalism", its imperial ambitions aimed at destabilizing objectionable governments and suppressing national liberation movements.

The unprecedented escalation in the U.S. military presence, the large-scale militaristic preparations, the unceasing maneuvers off the shores of independent countries of that region, the provocative actions against Cyprus, the campaign of blackmail against Syria, the threats of the use of force against other Mediterranean countries, the aggressive actions by Israel, U.S. strategic partner, and, finally, the unbridled anti-Libyan campaign have heated up to the limit the situation in that part of the world.

The matter boiled down to the U.S. direct armed attack on Libya -- a sovereign state and member of the United Nations organization -- which constitutes a flagrant violation of the UN Charter and the universally accepted standards of international law. Nor do threats to deal new strikes against Libya cease today. This policy of state terrorism can lead to grave consequences going far beyond the boundaries of the Mediterranean region.

It is quite apparent that the developments in the Mediterranean have a direct bearing on many countries, including the Soviet Union. Vitally interested in the assurance of the



security of the area, the USSR resolutely supports the proposal of the non-aligned countries to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and cooperation, and is prepared to make a weighty contribution to the consolidation of peace and cooperation in the Mediterranean called for by a resolution of the 40th session of UN General Assembly (40/157).

The Soviet proposals to spread agreed upon confidence-building measures to the area, to reduce armed forces, withdraw nuclear-armed ships from the Mediterranean, renounce the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear Mediterranean countries, and the adoption by nuclear powers of the pledge to not use such weapons against any Mediterranean country that does not allow deployment of them on its territory also remain valid.

The Soviet Union recently advanced a new far-reaching proposal to withdraw the navies of the United States and the USSR from the Mediterranean.

There is in principle no need for our country to keep its naval forces in the Mediterranean on a permanent basis. The Soviet Union has to permanently keep its ships in the area solely because the U.S. Sixth Fleet, equipped with nuclear missile weapons and threatening the security of the USSR and its allies and friends, is sailing close to our boundaries. If the United States, which is situated thousands upon thousands of miles away from the Mediterranean, withdraws its fleet from the area, the Soviet Union would simultaneously do the same. We are prepared to enter into talks on this matter without delay.

We believe that the further steps for the consolidation of security in the area could be determined by taking into consideration the Soviet proposals contained in the statement of January 15, 1986, on the elimination of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear and chemical) before the end of the current century.

The implementation of these practical measures, as well as reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe would undoubtedly result in an improvement of the situation in the Mediterranean and in the world as a whole and contribute to stronger security and to the establishment of normal relations among states.

Urgent steps capable of lessening tension and normalizing the situation in the Mediterranean must be resolved through the joint efforts of states and, in this context, it regards with understanding the initiatives of non-aligned Mediterranean countries, which are going to hold their second conference on Malta this year.

We think that a broader conference, similar to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, could play a useful role. The United States and other interested countries could attend such a conference, in addition to the Mediterranean states and other countries adjacent to that region. At such a conference, participating states could agree on the elaboration of certain recommendations to build up a regime of peace and security for the Mediterranean.

The problem of the Mediterranean has been under discussion at the United Nations for a number of years, and this discussion shows how worried the overwhelming majority of the states are by dangerous developments in that region. Generally useful decisions were taken on that problem, but the present situation demands concrete actions to strengthen security in the Mediterranean. A representative conference on this matter proposed by us could contribute to this goal.

It is the Soviet Union's belief that the United Nations should use its full prestige and every opportunity to contribute in practice to the establishment of a region of lasting peace, security and cooperation for all in the Mediterranean.

E. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs

/12858

CSO: 5200/1479

RELATED ISSUES

FRG SPD'S RAU DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN MOSCOW

Vorotnikov Speech

LD262012 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] An exhibition entitled "The People and Technology of the Land of North Rhine-Westphalia" opened in Moscow today on Krasnaya Presnya Embankment. The exhibition acquaints one with the economic potential and the science and technology of one of the major federal lands in the FRG.

A speech was made at the opening ceremony by Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. He said in Particular:

[Begin Vorotnikov recording] We regard the opening of this representative exhibition as an important event in relations between the Russian Federation and the Land of North Rhine-Westphalia. From the time of the first contacts in 1972 links between the Land of North Rhine-Westphalia and the Russian Federation have become fairly wide-ranging and now include the exchange of delegations and information in the sphere of urban and industrial construction, preservation of the environment, culture, art, sport, and education and partner-like relations between the cities of Russia and the Land of North Rhine-Westphalia.

In our view these varied links set a good example of equal and mutually beneficial cooperation. They are an integral part of the whole complex of Soviet-West German relations, which the Soviet Union is ready to continue developing on the basis of the Moscow Treaty.

We in the Soviet Union are convinced that in the nuclear and space age security can be ensured not by military-technical facilities and not by the stockpiling and perfecting of weaponry but by its consistent reduction and total elimination. This, indeed, is the aim of the Soviet Union's proposals on halting nuclear tests and ridding mankind of nuclear and chemical weapons, which have received a widespread response. This is the aim being pursued, too, by the comprehensive program for a substantial reduction of all the components of land forces and tactical strike of Europe, which was proposed at the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact countries. Our country will continue to spare no efforts in the struggle for peace and the security of peoples.

Permit me to express satisfaction at the arrival in the Soviet Union of Minister-President Rau and other visitors from the FRG.

4 August 1986

We hope that this visit and the meetings and conversations in Moscow will serve the cause of a further development of relations between our countries. [end recording]

The exhibition was opened by Johannes Rau, Minister-President of the Land of North Rhine-Westphalia, who has arrived in Moscow at the head of a delegation from the FRG. He said:

[Begin Rau recording in German with superimposed Russian translation] Many people here in Moscow and back home in the FRG has spared no effort to properly organize this large exhibition, in which about 300 firms are taking part. The aim of the exhibition is to show what we produce and how we live. Our wish is to promote the creation of an atmosphere of trust between both particular individuals and the peoples of the two countries. We remember with satisfaction the Soviet Union's national exhibition, which was held in Duesseldorf a few years ago. We hope that this exhibition of ours will continue the fine traditions and on a broader plane that as a whole such undertakings and the meetings and conversations here in Moscow will serve peace, which is needed by all peoples. We received the new Soviet peaceful proposals with great interest and hope. I believe that this visit to Moscow and the meetings and negotiations with Soviet leaders will serve the strengthening and safeguarding of peace. [end recording]

#### Rau Meets With Dobrynin, Zagladin

LD261746 Moscow TASS in English 1723 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had a conversation at the CPSU Central Committee today with Johannes Rau, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and minister-president of North Rhine-Westphalia (FRG).

They discussed some pressing questions of mutual interest, including the European aspects of international politics in the light of the proposals made by the Warsaw Treaty member countries to the NATO countries and all European countries. It was unanimously noted that all countries including, of course, the USSR and the FRG should make their contribution to the process of improving the situation in Europe.

Anatoliy Dobrynin and Johannes Rau spoke highly of the importance of contacts between the CPSU and the SDP [Social Democratic Party] and confirmed the readiness of their parties to develop them further in the interests of Soviet-West German relations, mutual understanding and peace.

Vadim Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the conversation that passed in a comradely atmosphere.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1479

## RELATED ISSUES

### USSR'S ARBATOV: U.S. PUBLIC IGNORANT OF SOVIET STANCES

PM141501 London MORNING STAR in English 11 Jul 86 p 6

[Soviet Academician Georgiy Arbatov article: "U.S. Is Refusing To Accept World Realities"]

[Text] In its foreign policy, the U.S. Administration is taking an enormous risk by relying on an already obsolete instrument -- confrontation.

The refusal to accept today's realities in inter-state relations and the world situation as a whole is a characteristic feature of the political mentality of official Washington.

The ossified views of the U.S. leaders are primarily manifest in their maniacal anti-communism, commitment to obsolete dogmas of the cold war, and cave-dueller-like militarism in international relations.

These views are throwing U.S. foreign policy at least two decades back.

Yet, they are being pursued at a time when the international situation is much more precarious, and arms levels are much higher.

The recent plenum of the CPSU Central Committee noted that the U.S. refusal to halt nuclear testing; its decision to withdraw from the SALT-2 treaty; the ongoing elaboration of space weapons; and the reluctance to hold conscientious talks on arms limitation and reduction, and on measures to ease international tensions are increasingly undermining the security of the whole world, including the United States.

I understand that a considerable part of the United States population and some of the population of West Europe for that matter, are mistrustful and cautious of the Soviet Union.

They see our country as their "enemy" and consider us "dangerous."

This is a result of many years of brainwashing that has been aimed at developing anti-Sovietism in people as a sort of "conditioned reflex."

There is also lack of knowledge about Soviet foreign and home policies, about the Soviet programme against the nuclear threat and the arms race, and for the preservation and consolidation of universal peace, as advanced by the 27th congress of our party.

Will anyone tell the U.S. citizens that at the recent fifth session of the 11th Supreme Soviet of the USSR almost every speaker stressed the need to work for halting the arms race and preventing the transfer of weapons to space?

I don't think this will happen.

Nor will the much-boasted "free press," to say nothing of the U.S. political leaders, advise the people about the fact that in the past six months Moscow has addressed the Western powers with an all-embracing package of radical proposals.

These proposals are aimed at curbing the arms race and enhancing the security of each and every country.

Nor will the press and U.S. leaders tell them that the Soviet Union has set forth a programme for the total elimination of nuclear weapons in 15 years, by the beginning of the 21st century, and that it has suggested cuts in all components of ground troops and tactical aviation in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The latter initiative was advanced by the Socialist countries united in the Warsaw treaty in a communique and addressed at the recent conference of its political consultative committee in Budapest.

Needless to say, we cannot blame the United States public at large for its failure to know about Soviet initiatives, or for a distorted idea about them.

The U.S. people know only what they are being told.

But U.S. statesmen are quite another matter. Of all people, they know the Soviet position inside out.

And if today the Reagan administration is turning a deaf ear to our calls to stop the arms race and improve the situation, the blame for this rests with it alone, for its policy of crude force.

This is a senseless policy which is equally dangerous for those whom Washington considers its enemies, for those it regards as allies, and for the U.S. people themselves.

Continuation of the arms race which is fuelled by United States military programmes, may bring the level of the sides' armaments to a point at which nothing could be a factor of military-political deterrent.

All Soviet peace proposals are aimed at lowering the level of military confrontation. It is important to begin lowering the strategic balance and to steer the course toward complete withdrawal of nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction from arsenals. Armed force cannot ensure genuine security to anyone in our age. One gets the impression that the United States administration, far from wishing to understand this, is probably unable to see this, since it is going into the future with its back turned to it.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1479



## RELATED ISSUES

### DAILY TELEGRAPH VIEWS SDP-LIBERAL ALLIANCE COMMISSION ISSUES

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 12 Jun 86 p 8

[Text] The development of a stronger "European pillar" within Nato, aimed at ensuring a better balance of decision-making and defence burdens between the United States and her allies, was called for in the [Joint SDP-Liberal Alliance Defense] commission's report.

This would strengthen the alliance as a whole, thereby reducing the risk of a possible future American withdrawal from Europe, it said.

Members of the European Community should be ready to develop common policies, in order both to carry more weight in international affairs collectively than they could individually, and to increase the effectiveness of their defence spending by common research, development and procurement of equipment.

#### Minimum deterrence

Among other proposals in the report to strengthen the concept of collective security in Western defence were:

Defensive policies based on the concept of minimum deterrent and with greater reliance on conventional forces.

Nato commanders should plan on the basis that nuclear forces would not be used and should not be needed. Spending priority should be directed to strengthening conventional forces and their support systems, including prudent investment in new technology.

Deep cuts in both United States and Soviet stocks of strategic nuclear weapons.

A commitment by the United States and the Soviet Union to maintain and strengthen the anti-ballistic missile treaty. President Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative should be restricted to such research as

was permitted by the treaty.

Britain should encourage America and Russia to reaffirm their commitment to the treaty and agree to increase the period of notice for its abrogation from six months to five years.

#### Positive response

A positive British response to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing, and a resumption of the tripartite British - American - Soviet negotiations for a permanent comprehensive test ban.

A strengthening of measures to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

Withdrawal of battlefield nuclear weapons from a zone extending 150 kilometres from the East West divided in Europe.

A treaty banning the development, manufacture and possession of chemical weapons and meanwhile no manufacture of fresh stocks.

Agreement on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe and a re-examination of proposals for military disengagement.

"The long-term objective is to overcome the East - West division of Europe, through the reduction of forces to mutually agreed levels, and the construction of a system of common security based upon mutual trust and respect.

This could lead to an eventual disengagement of Soviet forces

-from Eastern Europe and the withdrawal of American forces from Western Europe."

#### Crisis centres

It also emphasises the need for better communications between key decision centres and proposes a network of crisis control centres.

Such centres would link the capitals of the nuclear weapon states and other key command and control centres, providing instant audio, visual and documentary contact between leaders in any situation involving the actual or possible use of nuclear weapons.

The commission says it has worked instinctively towards a goal of achieving common security, and concludes that this can only be found with imagination and determination, with the overriding aim of reducing the military share of the world economy, achieving more productive use of world resources and human skills and to promoting co-operation instead of force.

We reject the assumption of a perpetual division of Europe into two camps. Efforts must be made to break the traditional mould of East - West relations and end the military confrontation which divides and imperils Europe.

"Our recommendations are designed to generate a more positive and effective British contribution to these challenges."

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

BEIJING RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE--Beijing, 1 Jul--A closing session of the International Council of the World Conference on "Religion for Peace" adopted an open letter to the conference's regional, government, and local sections urging them to strengthen the resolve of all believers to achieve total and general disarmament. The letter says that it is essential to conclude a treaty on a total nuclear test ban and the prevention of the militarization of space. The session was attended by more than 100 religious figures and observers from 30 of the world's countries and regions and 41 religious organizations including a delegation of the Russian Orthodox Church headed by Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich. [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5 PM] /9738

CSO: 5200/1461

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

4 Sept 86